

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Godrej Industries Limited, Godrej Seeds and Genetics Private Limited v.
Tanmay Santra, Nissan Agrotech
Case No. D2025-2430

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Godrej Industries Limited (“First Complainant”) and Godrej Seeds and Genetics Private Limited (“Second Complainant”), India, represented by Scriboard Advocates & Legal Consultants, India.

The Respondent is Tanmay Santra, Nissan Agrotech, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <godrejseedandgenetics.com> is registered with OwnRegistrar, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 18, 2025. On June 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Maninder Singh as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 First Complainant operates in several business segments, including manufacturing and selling of oleochemicals and edible oils and has presence in Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Africa. The Second Complainant is a group company of the Godrej Industries Group involved in trading, cultivation, and marketing of high-quality hybrid seeds. The Complainants are part of the Godrej Industries Group, a global conglomerate headquartered in Mumbai, Maharashtra, India, which was founded in 1897, and has been successfully conducting its business throughout the world for more than 126 years. The Godrej Industries Group has business worldwide in different sectors such as real estate, consumer products chemicals, and agricultural products. The First Complainant is the holding company of the Godrej Industries Group.

The Complainants, through another group company, namely Godrej Consumer Product Ltd., applied for trademark GODREJ in 1942 and registered it under trademark certificate No. 21630 dated September 10, 1948. The Complainants have acquired statutory rights in the mark GODREJ. The Complainants have registered its mark GODREJ in various jurisdictions across the world.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 4, 2024 and was used for a website offering agricultural goods and bearing a similar logo to the Complainant's logo, also bearing an address associated to the Complainants.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainants are part of the Godrej Industries Group, a global conglomerate headquartered in Mumbai, Maharashtra, India, which was founded in 1897, and has been successfully conducting its business throughout the world for more than 126 years. The GODREJ' mark composes the corporate name as well as is the primary brand name of the Complainants and their group companies. It has been used extensively over the years for their business as well as their corporate identity.

The Complainants and their group companies have been using the trademark/name GODREJ extensively and continuously for more than a century and have thus acquired secondary meaning in the mark.

The First Complainant is a group company of the Godrej Industries Group and owns several popular brands. It is also the owner of the brand GODREJ. The Complainants have secured trademark registrations for the mark GODREJ and several other related marks in India as well as in several other jurisdictions. The official website of the First Complainant "www.godrejindustries.com" is a comprehensive, unique, and acclaimed introduction to the Godrej Group. The domain name <godrejindustries.com> was registered in the year 2002.

The Complainants and their group companies also own several domain names relating to or consisting of their trademark GODREJ, such as <godrejagrovvet.com>, <godrejcp.com>, <godrejindustries.com>, <godrejafrica.com>, etc. An indicative list, containing 99 domain names registered by the Complainant has been submitted as Annexure H by the Complainants.

The Complainant's trademark GODREJ, registered since 1948, is identified by the purchasing public exclusively with the Complainants, and has earned enormous goodwill not only in India but in several other countries across the globe. The GODREJ brand is one of the most popular brands in India as well as in several other jurisdictions.

The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Trademark or Service Mark of the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that a mere glance at the disputed domain name gives rise to enormous confusion as to its origin, as the disputed domain name is identical to the well-known trademark/service mark of the Complainants. The utmost mala fide intention of the Respondent is evident from the fact that the Respondent has copied the entirety of the Complainants' registered and well-known trademark.

The Complainants further contend that the website previously available on the disputed domain name (which was disabled following the submission of a police complaint by the Complainants), purported to provide agricultural goods, which is related to the goods and services sold by the Second Complainant. Since the Second Complainant manufactures and sells a wide variety of agricultural goods, any member of the general public would mistakenly assume that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainants' business. Thus, the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent is a prima facie case of cybersquatting and trade/service mark/name infringement and passing off.

The Complainants have referred to and relied upon various decisions of prior UDRP disputes such as *Fondation Le Corbusier v. Monsieur Bernard Weber, Madame Heidi Weber*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0251](#); *SoftCom Technology Consulting Inc. v. Olariu Romeo/Orv Fin Group S.L.*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0792](#); *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. P Martin*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0323](#); *RapidShare AG, Christian Schmid v. Protected Domain Services/Dmytro Gerasymenko*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1071](#), and *Rockwool International A/S v. usrockwool.com/US Rockwool LLC, formerly US Fireproofing LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-1022](#) - holding that in cases where a domain name includes the entire trademark or a prominent feature of the trademark is easily recognizable in the domain name, the domain name is typically considered to be similar and confusing to the trademark.

The Complainant also contends that the use of an identical/deceptively similar mark by any other concern to that of the well-known and extremely famous mark GODREJ is bound to lead to confusion and deception and amounts to passing off as well as trademark infringement. Any person or entity using the well-known and famous mark/name GODREJ in any manner is bound to lead customers and users to infer that its product or service has an association or nexus with the Complainants. Moreover, the use of the descriptive term "seedandgenetics" in the disputed domain name makes it apparent that the disputed domain name is being used to impersonate the Complainants in order to confuse innocent individuals who would mistakenly assume that the disputed domain name is associated with the Second Complainant.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it is very likely that an Internet user, who would want to search for seeds and agricultural products by the Second Complainant would search for the term "Godrej Seeds and Genetics". Such a search would inadvertently lead the Internet user to the disputed domain name and the user would mistakenly assume that the disputed domain name and the services potentially offered through it are being offered by the Second Complainant.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no proprietary or contractual rights in any registered or common law trade mark corresponding in whole or in part to the disputed domain name.

The Complainants contend that:

- the Respondent has no connection with the Complainants, or any company licensed by the Complainants;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or the trademark, and;
- the Respondent was not and is not authorized by the Complainants to register, hold, or use the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not, either as an individual, business, or other organization, commonly known by the name "Godrej". The Complainants have not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trade/service mark GODREJ or to apply for any domain name incorporating this mark.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainants, nor has the Respondent ever been authorized by the Complainants to use the Complainants' trademarks or register the disputed domain name. The Complainants have no relationship with the Respondent.

Bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent

The Complainants contend that it is inconceivable that the registration of the disputed domain name was made without full knowledge of the existence of the Complainants and their well-known trademark.

The Complainants further contend that the addition of the term "seedandgenetics" after the GODREJ trademark in the disputed domain name makes it apparent that the Respondent is deliberately trying to associate the disputed domain name with the well-known GODREJ brand.

The Complainants also contend that the Respondent is misrepresenting itself as a representative of the Complainants and is using the disputed domain name to bolster its business. The registered address of their business is identical to that of the Complainants' and the Respondent is thus clearly attempting to capitalize on the goodwill associated with the Complainants' brand. According to the Complainants, "[t]his constitutes strong evidence of bad faith".

It is further contention of the Complainants that in light of the Respondent's presumed knowledge of the Complainants' rights, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention to target these rights by misrepresenting itself as an associate or subsidiary of the Complainants.

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

For a Complaint to succeed in relation to a domain name, a complainant is required to prove that:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and,

(iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The First Complainant through its group companies have trademark registrations for the word mark GODREJ. The Complainants have placed on record the list of trademark registrations for GODREJ and various combinations thereof. The Panel has seen copies of registration certificates placed by the Complainant in Annexure F, submitted by the Complainants, showing status of various registrations of GODREJ mark in different classes. The Complainants have established rights in the above trademarks, both by virtue of its trademark registrations and as a result of the goodwill and reputation acquired through its use of the trademarks over many years.

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

The Panel finds that the registered trademark of the Complainants, GODREJ, has been fully reproduced in the disputed domain name. The addition of the term “seedsandgenetics” does 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 that the entirety of the 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.

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.

The Panel observes, based on the available record, that the Respondent is in no way related to the Complainants or their business activities. The Respondent is neither an agent of the Complainants, nor does he carry out activities for the Complainant. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The marks GODREJ indisputably vest in the Complainants as evidenced by various trademark registrations, secured by the Complainant and the Complainant's group, not only in India but across the globe.

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 Complainants' 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.

The Panel further notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the GODREJ trademark as well as almost the entirety of the Second Complainant's company name, and the use of the disputed domain name to host a website impersonating the Complainants, with the use of the Complainants' logo and an associated address. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a 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.

The Panel observes that there is virtually no possibility that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark, its existence or presence in the market. In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name to deceive Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated or authorized by the Complainants, and to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the mark GODREJ for commercial gain. The Panel observes that the Respondent is squatting on the said domain and not making any legitimate commercial use of the same.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <godrejseedandgenetics.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Maninder Singh/

Maninder Singh

Sole Panelist

Date: July 29, 2025