

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Taofeek Ismail  
Case No. D2025-3312

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Taofeek Ismail, United States of America.

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

The disputed domain name <syngenta-pl.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed 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 19, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 20, 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 20, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 August 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 12, 2025.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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 science-based agtech company, with 30,00 employees in over 90 countries, trading under its SYNGENTA trademark. This includes a robust business in Poland. Details of world-wide registrations of its SYNGENTA trademark has been supplied to the Panel. These registrations include International Registration No. 732663, registered on March 8, 2000 (whose protection extends to Poland) and United States Registration No. 3,036,058, registered on December 27, 2005.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 27, 2025, and is inactive.

#### **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 Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant has never granted permission to the Respondent to use its SYNGENTA trademark in connection with the registration of a domain name, or otherwise. The Complainant submits further that the confusingly similar disputed domain name's non-resolving status poses potential reputational risks to the Complainant and could mislead the public into believing it is a non-functioning official Syngenta website. The Complainant submits that such passive holding constitutes bad faith.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1.

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. The mere addition of a hyphen and the geographical indicator "pl", designating Poland, in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between that 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**

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.

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

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Taking the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark into consideration, the Panel finds it implausible that the disputed domain name was adopted without the Complainant's trademark in mind. This justifies a finding of registration of the disputed domain name in bad faith, and the Panel so finds.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <syngenta-pl.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/George R. F. Souter/*

**George R. F. Souter**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 1, 2025