

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MHG IP Holding (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. v. Mohan Mishra
Case No. D2025-2366

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MHG IP Holding (Singapore) Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Kochhar & Co., India.

The Respondent is Mohan Mishra, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <clubanantarasuitesandretreat.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 16, 2025. On June 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 18, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (REGISTRANT PRIVATE) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 19, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 23, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 24, 2025. The Center sent an email to the Parties on June 24, 2025, regarding a possible settlement. In an email dated June 25, 2025, the Complainant informed the Center that it would not request suspension of the proceedings. The Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with Panel Appointment on July 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Singapore IP holding company that is part of a corporate group that operates a chain of hotels under the “Anantara” brand which it has used since at least 2000. The Complainant’s corporate group owns, operates or manages over 50 luxury hotels and over 30 spas under the “Anantara” brand in the Middle East, Africa, Europe, and Asia including in India, the location of the Respondent, and has developed a significant reputation in India.

The ANANTARA trademark has been in use since 2000 and the Complainant is the owner of a large number of registered trademarks for ANANTARA in numerous jurisdictions, including:

Malaysian trademark Nos. 01005467 and 01005468 (both figurative), registered on February 26, 2004, and, May 18, 2005, respectively, in classes 35 and 43 respectively;

Indian trademark Nos. 5175781, 5175783, and 5175785, registered on October 16, 2021, in classes 3, 36, and 44 respectively; and

Australian Registration No. 1964293, registered on June 29, 2018.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <anantara.com>, which promotes its services prominently using “ANANTARA Hotels & Resorts” on top of which appears a logo in form of a triangle. It has also registered the domain name <anantaravacationclub.com> in 2010, which relates to a vacation ownership program.

The Complainant actively promotes and advertises its ANANTARA trademarks in social media where it has thousands of followers.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 24, 2023, and resolves to a website that advertises vacation and spa experiences as well as wellness activities in several Indian and international destinations and properties. According to the website, it appears that the properties are not Anantara Suites and Retreat properties, but hotels belonging to several other hotel chains. The website displays the terms “Club Anantara Suites and Retreat” with a logo composed of a crown device with three branches in a triangle form. The website includes different sections such as “About”, “Destinations”, “Membership Plans”, “Contact”, “Join Us”, and “Member Login”. On the homepage there are booking details including phone numbers and email addresses using the <casuitesandretreat.com> domain name. Several links such as the “Get direction” link and the link to a video are disabled. The website also mentions the name of a company “Club Anantara Suites and Retreat Pvt Ltd.” having an address in Uttar Pradesh (India).

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s ANANTARA mark and is used with respect to identical services.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent adopted the disputed domain name with the sole intention to use the fame, reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's ANANTARA trademark.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent's disputed domain name and website deceives the public and creates confusion as to the source and association with the Complainant by unduly using the Complainant's well-known trademark. The Respondent was previously using the domain name <clubanantara.com> against which the Complainant filed a UDRP complaint on September 17, 2024, and which was transferred to the Complainant. The Respondent also uses the domain name <casuitesandretreat.com> with the same intention of misleading the consumers since "ca" refers to club anantara and the domain name resolves to a website identical to the one at the disputed domain name, offering services identical to those of the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions but stated in an email to the Center of June 24, 2025, that "the parties are ready for mediation, both companies have separate identities and separate domains".

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark ANANTARA for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ANANTARA mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "club" as well as "suites and retreat", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant

evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

More specifically, the Panel notes that the Respondent did not provide explanations as to whether a legitimate business is operated under the Anantara name and the reasons for choosing such name in order to operate hotel and spa services. The Respondent did also not disclose his connection to the business operated under the disputed domain name and to the company Club Anantara Suites and Retreat Pvt Ltd. mentioned on the said website. There is no evidence in the case file as to whether this company and the resorts referred to in the website linked to the disputed domain name actually exist. To the contrary, the website in question contains email addresses connected to the domain name <casuitesandretreat.com> which is allegedly also run by the Respondent, as well as several links including a video which are disabled.

Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that the composition and use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or of a service on the Respondent's website. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

In particular, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that its ANANTARA trademark is distinctive and has acquired a certain level of notoriety in relation to hotel services due to its long-standing use in India and other countries, as well as on the Internet and social media since more than 10 years.

The disputed domain name was registered in 2023, which is long after the registration and use of the Complainant's ANANTARA trademark which creates a clear inference that the Respondent knew about the Complainant's rights in ANANTARA when registering the disputed domain name.

The fact that the disputed domain name contains the Complainant's distinctive ANANTARA trademark and is used in connection with hotel and spa services, which is in the same exact field as the Complainant, shows that the Respondent tried to profit off of the Complainant's reputation and trademark in an illegitimate way, particularly since the Respondent did not provide any information as to whether the company and the business Club Anantara Suites and Retreat Pvt referred to on the website linked to the disputed domain name exist and are operational and instead merely sent an email saying it was ready to mediate and settle. It is also noted that the Respondent's website has a similar look and feel, and even logo to that of the Complainant. Additionally, the Complainant uses the domain name <anantaravacationclub.com> further suggesting an illicit attempt on the part of the Respondent to create an affiliation with the Complainant also by use of the "club" moniker.

Finally, the Panel notes that the Respondent chose to use a privacy service to register the disputed domain name, which is an additional indication of bad faith use and registration.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <clubanantarasuitesandretreat.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Theda König Horowicz/

Theda König Horowicz

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2025