

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**Tyco Fire & Security LLC v. Santosh Gajre**  
**Case No. D2025-2614**

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Tyco Fire & Security LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Anand & Anand, India.

The Respondent is Santosh Gajre, India.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <ittgrinnellcorporation.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 3, 2025. On July 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 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 (Integrity Softwares LLP, Maharashtra) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 8, 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 July 11, 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 July 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Christopher J. Pibus as the sole panelist in this matter on August 19, 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 manufactures and delivers a wide range of fire suppression systems, including sprinkler systems, valves, piping products, pipe fittings and fire-fighting equipment and services for customers in more than 150 countries worldwide. Its global portfolio includes some well-known brands including: TYCO, and GRINNELL. The founder of the Grinnell business was Frederick Grinnell, a pioneer in fire safety products and the creator of one of the earliest automatic fire sprinklers. Beginning in 1919 his business operated under the name Grinnell Co. In 1969, Grinnell Co. was purchased by ITT (International Telephone & Telegraph) and became ITT Grinnell. In 1976, the Complainant purchased ITT Grinnell. For more than 100 years, the Complainant and its predecessors in title have been using the GRINNELL trademark and trade name.

The Complainant is the owner of registrations for the GRINNELL trademark in many countries around the world, including India. The Complainant's evidence includes examples of numerous registrations, dating back to 1910, when the GRINNELL mark was first registered in the United States (Reg. No. 71043919).

Particulars of the Complainant's registered marks in India are as follows:

| Trademark | Class       | Reg. No. | Reg. Date         |
|-----------|-------------|----------|-------------------|
| GRINNELL  | 6           | 497503   | September 8, 1988 |
| GRINNELL  | 7           | 497504   | September 8, 1988 |
| GRINNELL  | 19          | 497505   | September 8, 1988 |
| GRINNELL  | 1           | 497502   | September 8, 1988 |
| GRINNELL  | 6,11,17, 42 | 2472120  | February 5, 2013  |

The Respondent appears to be located in India. The disputed domain name was registered on May 13, 2022, and is associated with a website for a business called International Technologies & Traders (ITT) Grinnel Corporation, which appears to sell metal hardware items, including pipe hangers and pipe fittings. On its website the Respondent uses a variant spelling of the trademark, i.e., "Grinnel" with only one "l".

#### 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 its GRINNELL trademark is highly distinctive and well known internationally, with registrations around the world, including India where the Respondent resides. In the absence of any response from the Respondent, the Complainant urges the Panel to find deliberate targeting of the well-known mark for improper purposes.

##### B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed 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 Complainant has provided evidence of the existence of relevant trademarks, by providing proof of a number of registrations including those listed in paragraph 4 above. The Panel notes the existence of five registrations for GRINNELL in India where the Respondent is located. Evidence of acquired reputation in the GRINNELL brand has also been provided to support the conclusion that the mark is known internationally for many years. The Panel concludes that the Complainant has established that it owns sufficient rights, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the GRINNELL mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name and the Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 "itt" and "corporation", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 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. In particular, the Complainant has presented evidence of the long-standing international reputation it has garnered for the GRINNELL brand and has put forward cogent evidence and submissions that the Respondent has never been licensed or otherwise authorized to register or use the mark. The Respondent appears to be using its confusingly similar disputed domain name in association with a website offering for sale similar wares to those sold by the Complainant also under a highly similar name ITT Grinnel, in a manner consistent with deliberate targeting. 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.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy also sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent set out to target the Complainant by copying the GRINNELL word mark as the primary element of the disputed domain name, and also copied the composition of the Complainant's subsidiary's trade name ITT Grinnell in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent was likely fully aware of the Complainant's rights in the GRINNELL mark, due to the distinctive nature of the mark, the duration of its prior use and registrations dating back more than 100 years, and its extensive reputation around the world. The Panel notes the exact reproduction of the mark in the disputed domain name, used in combination with the prefix "itt". The addition of this prefix is compelling evidence of bad faith targeting as it replicates the company name used by the Complainant's subsidiary. In all the circumstances, it appears that the Respondent was knowingly targeting the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name in May 2022.

In terms of bad faith use, the Panel relies on a number of factors, including (1) the misappropriation of the exact GRINNELL mark for use on wares which closely resemble the products and categories sold by the Complainant; (2) the adoption of the prefix ITT, to replicate the exact combination in the trade name ITT Grinnell, one of the Complainant's subsidiaries; and (3) the Respondent has been using a variant spelling of the mark on its associated website, promoting the business name as ITT Grinnel Corporation (with a single "l"), while it continues to use the original spelling of Grinnell in the disputed domain name itself, thereby increasing the likelihood of confusion. All of these elements are probative of deliberate targeting and bad faith.

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

## **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 <ittgrinnellcorporation.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Christopher J. Pibus/*

**Christopher J. Pibus**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 2, 2025