

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. 林春水 (lin chun shui)
Case No. D2025-3310

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Syngenta Crop Protection AG, Switzerland, internally represented .

The Respondent is 林春水(lin chun shui), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syngentaseeds.shop> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Limited (阿里云计算有限公司 (万网)) (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 18, 2025. On August 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 20, 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 (Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 22, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on August 25, 2025.

On August 22, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On August 25, 2025, Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. Respondent did not submit any comment on Complainant’s submission.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on September 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on October 1, 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

A. Complainant

Complainant, Syngenta Crop Protection AG., is a company incorporated in Switzerland. It is a global, science-based agricultural-technology ("agtech") company employing about 30 000 people in more than 90 countries. Its core businesses include crop-protection agrochemicals and vegetable and flower seeds.

Complainant has rights in the SYNGENTA and SYNGENTA-related marks. Complainant is the owner of numerous SYNGENTA trademarks worldwide, including the United States of America ("USA") trademark registered on December 27, 2005 (the USA Trademark registration number 3036058), and the International trademark registered on March 8, 2000 (the International trademark registration number 732663) (Annexes 3a-3c to the Complaint).

Complainant also owns numerous domain names incorporating the SYNGENTA mark, such as <syngenta.com>, <syngenta.cn>, <syngenta-us.com>, <syngenta.us>, <syngenta.com.au>, <syngenta.fr>, <syngenta.co>, and <syngenta.co.uk>.

B. Respondent

Respondent is 林春水(lin chun shui), China.

C. The Domain Name

The disputed domain name was registered on June 27, 2025. According to the Complaint and the supporting evidence, the disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website offering a variety of products for sale, including corsets, pants, hip pads, and car seats (Annex 4a to the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's SYNGENTA trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the SYNGENTA trademark in its entirety. The mere addition of the descriptive term "seeds", which is directly related to Complainant's business, is insufficient to dispel the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's trademark.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

From the evidence presented on the record, no agreement appears to have been entered into between Complainant and Respondent to the effect that the language of the proceeding should be English. Complainant filed its Complaint and amended Complaint in English, and has requested that English be the language of the proceeding for the following main reasons:

- (a) The disputed domain name includes the English word "seeds" and resolves to a website that is entirely in English, indicating that Respondent is familiar with and capable of understanding English;
- (b) The website also lists contact information suggesting that the company is located in the USA;
- (c) The ".shop" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") has global application and is not limited to any particular linguistic or geographic group, further supporting the appropriateness of English as the language of these proceedings;
- (d) Requiring Complainant to translate the Complaint into Chinese would impose an unnecessary and unfair burden.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

On the record, Respondent appears to be located in China and thus presumably not a native English speaker, but considering the following aspects, the Panel has decided that the language of the proceeding shall be English: (a) the disputed domain name is registered in Latin characters, particularly English words (e.g., "seeds"), rather than Chinese script; (b) the gTLD of the disputed domain name is ".shop", so the disputed domain name seems to be prepared for users worldwide, particularly in English-speaking countries; (c) the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage entirely in English (Annex 4a to the Complaint); (d) the Center has notified Respondent of the language of the proceeding in both Chinese and English, and Respondent has indicated no objection to Complainant's request that English be the language of the proceeding; and (e) the Center also notified Respondent in both Chinese and English of the Complaint, and informed Respondent that it would accept a Response in either English or Chinese, but Respondent chose not to file any Response.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues: Three Elements

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Complainant's SYNGENTA 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.

While the addition of the term "seeds" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent has not provided evidence or reasons to justify the choice of the term "Syngenta", which is the same as Complainant's SYNGENTA trademark, in the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the SYNGENTA trademark or to register or use any domain name incorporating the SYNGENTA marks;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on June 27, 2025, long after the SYNGENTA mark was registered. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's SYNGENTA marks; and

(iii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. By contrast, the disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website offering a variety of products for sale, including corsets, pants, hip pads, and car seats (Annex 4a to the Complaint). The Panel notes that the products on Respondent's website do not appear to have any connection with Complainant. Therefore, Respondent has attempted to make profits through the Internet traffic attracted to the website under the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant's trademark.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy 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.

Based on the information provided by Complainant, the Panel finds that Complainant has a reputation in the SYNGENTA marks with regard to its products and services. It is not conceivable that Respondent would not have had Complainant's trademark in mind at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name (in 2025). This has been reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's SYNGENTA trademark entirely (merely adding "seeds" as the suffix).

Respondent has used the website offering a variety of products for sale, including corsets, pants, hip pads, and car seats (Annex 4a to the Complaint). Accordingly, the Panel concludes that Respondent is using a confusingly similar disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 <syngentaseeds.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/

Yijun Tian

Sole Panelist

Date: October 24, 2025