

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Synopsys, Inc. v. edward thomas, amc, and Susan miles
Case No. D2025-3371

1. The Parties

Complainant is Synopsys, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

Respondents are edward thomas, amc, and Susan miles, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <synopsis.host> and <synopsys.today> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 21, 2025. On August 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 25, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting that Complainant either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that both disputed domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 28, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on September 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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 is a multinational company based in the United States. For several decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain names, Complainant has offered electronic solutions and related products under the mark SYNOPSIS. In this regard, Complainant is the owner of numerous registrations for its SYNOPSIS mark in jurisdictions around the world. These include, among others, United States Trademark Registration Nos. 1601521 (registered June 12, 1990) and 1618482 (registered October 23, 1990).

B. Respondent

The disputed domain name <synopsis.host> was registered on July 23, 2025, and the disputed domain name <synopsys.today> was registered on July 25, 2025. The registration information provided for each to the Registrar identifies different registrants. Complainant nevertheless alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or are otherwise under common control. Complainant thus requests consolidation of the Complaint against the listed registrants of the disputed domain names pursuant to paragraphs 3(c) and 10(e) and of the Rules.

Pursuant to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2, the Panel considers whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. The disputed domain names were registered within two days of each other. The registration for each provides the same mailing address. Furthermore, both have been used in the same manner, in connection with an email address, to contact perspective job recruits under the guise of being an official representative of Complainant.

The Panel finds that Complainant has shown prima facie evidence of common control, which the listed registrants named collectively as Respondent have neither addressed nor rebutted. The request to consolidate the Complaint as to the two disputed domain names is granted.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names do not resolve to any active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the SYNOPSIS mark, which it has used globally to great success, now trading as a public company (SNPS) listed on NASDAQ stock exchange, with over 20,000 employees, and 2024 revenue of over 6.1 billion USD. Complainant contends that Respondent has incorporated in full Complainant's SYNOPSIS mark into the disputed domain name <synopsys.today>, and has done the same with <synopsis.host> with only a slight misspelling, qualifying as typosquatting.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names, and rather has registered and is using them in bad faith, having simply acquired the disputed domain names for Respondent's own commercial gain. In particular, Complainant asserts that Respondent has set up an email address associated with each of the disputed domain names, which Respondent has used in an attempt to impersonate Complainant for recruitment in a fraudulent employment phishing scheme.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel must first determine whether the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The Panel finds that they are. Both of the disputed domain names directly incorporate the Complainant's SYNOPSIS mark, either as is or with a slight misspelling. The Panel finds that the mark is recognizable within each of the disputed domain names. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel therefore finds that each of the disputed domain names is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel next considers whether Complainant has shown that Respondent has no "rights or legitimate interest", as must be proven to succeed in a UDRP dispute. Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy gives examples that might show rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. These examples include: (i) use of the domain name "in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services"; (ii) demonstration that respondent has been "commonly known by the domain name"; or (iii) "legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue".

No evidence has been presented to the Panel that might support a claim of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and Respondent has no license from, or other affiliation with, Complainant. Furthermore, UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (such as phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests upon a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant has made a prima facie showing of Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, which Respondent has not rebutted.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Decision, each of the disputed domain names has been used in

connection with an email address, to contact perspective job recruits under the guise of being an official working for Complainant. Given the use of the disputed domain names in connection with correspondence specifically referencing Complainant and its SYNOPSYS mark, the Panel finds that Respondent was aware of Complainant's rights. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity constitutes bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Therefore, the Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 names <synopsis.host> and <synopsys.today> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: October 10, 2025