

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cisco Technology, Inc. v. Kamal Vallipuram
Case No. D2025-3822

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cisco Technology, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Fenwick & West, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Kamal Vallipuram, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cisconfirepower.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 September 19, 2025. On September 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 23, 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 (Customers of Domains by Proxy, LLC / Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 23, 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 September 24, 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 September 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2025. The Parties exchanged email communications on September 24 and September 29, 2025. The Respondent sent another communication to the Center on September 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit a formal response. On October 20, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano, Georges Nahitchevansky and Christopher J. Pibus as panelists in this matter on November 10, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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.

On November 21, 2025, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited Supplemental Filing, the Panel has reviewed it and decided not to admit it. The Panel notes that, even if admitted, it would not have changed the outcome of the case.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a formal response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Cisco Technology Inc., a United States company operating as one of the worldwide technology leaders, providing a wide array of products and services ranging from networking and communications equipment and software, including telephone communications systems, video conferencing systems, and collaboration products and services, to financing services, retail store services, training and certification programs and blogs. The Complainant owns several trademark registrations worldwide for CISCO, FIREPOWER, and CISCO FIREPOWER, including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1542339 for CISCO, registered on June 6, 1989;
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA520923 for CISCO, registered on December 23, 1999;
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA997331 for FIREPOWER, applied for on March 11, 2015 and registered on May 24, 2018;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 4974428 for CISCO FIREPOWER, applied for on March 10, 2015 and registered on June 7, 2016.

The Complainant also owns several domain name registrations for CISCO, among which <cisco.com>, <cisco.net>, <cisco.biz>, <cisco.info>, <cisco.mobi>, <cisco.us>.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was registered on October 2, 2015, and it redirects Internet users to the website at "www.digitalnet.ca", in which some of the same services as the Complainant, namely IT, audio visual, cyber security and mobility solutions, are offered. According to the evidence on file, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a parked page.

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 disputed domain name is identical to its trademark CISCO FIREPOWER and is confusingly similar to its trademarks CISCO and FIREPOWER.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the website at “www.digitalnet.ca”, which features the Respondent’s competing managed IT, audio visual, and mobility solutions and services, improperly benefiting from the Complainant’s trademarks reputation by deceiving Internet users into thinking they are going to access the Complainant’s website.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant’s trademarks CISCO, FIREPOWER and CISCO FIREPOWER are well known in the IT field. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant’s trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has used of the disputed domain name in bad faith to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no formal response to the Complainant’s contentions. However, as noted above, the Parties exchanged the following email communications on September 24 and September 29, 2025:

“I’m not sure if this is a spam or valid email. Could you please let me know what is the issue with the domain name ciscofirepower.com Thank you”. (From the Respondent to the Complainant, on September 24, 2025);

“Thanks for getting in touch. We represent Cisco in IP matters. The concern is that the domain name uses Cisco’s name/brand for related services. That’s why Cisco has filed a Uniform Domain-Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) proceeding with the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). While we’ve been instructed to pursue the UDRP, this doesn’t have to be complicated—if you’re ok with it, we can wrap this up easily if you agree to transfer the domain to Cisco by signing a simple form authorizing WIPO to move ahead with the domain transfer. WIPO will then help transfer the domain and close the matter out. Of course, there will be no impact to your current use of your digitalnet.ca domain. Our client’s focus is simply the ciscofirepower.com domain. Please let me know if you have any questions or want to discuss. Sincerely”. (From the Complainant to the Respondent, on September 24, 2025);

“Thank you for getting back to me. I will investigate why the domain is getting forward to digitalnet.ca If this is something causing an issue then we can certainly disable the DNS forwarding rule. We can transfer the domain if they are willing to pay for it.

Thank you”. (From the Respondent to the Complainant, on September 24, 2025)

“Just following up on my previous email. Is there anything we can do to resolve this matter? Please let me know. Best regards”. (From the Respondent to the Complainant, on September 29, 2025);

“Cisco is happy to resolve this now if you authorize WIPO to transfer the domain, but it will not pay for the transfer. Please let us know if you would like to move forward.

Dear [Center]

Please see the below correspondence with the registrant requesting payment to transfer the ciscofirepower.com domain to Complainant. Complainant requests approval to amend its complaint to include this payment request as evidence of registrant’s bad faith.

Sincerely”. (From the Complainant to the Respondent and to the Center, on September 29, 2025);

The Respondent also sent the following email communication to the Center:

“Thank you for your email, [...]. While I am not entirely familiar with domain regulations, I am confident that I have not broken any laws in Canada. We have been Cisco certified partners and have been managing Cisco firewalls for over 20 years. Currently, I am in the process of hiring a lawyer to address this issue. Once I have retained legal counsel, they will communicate with all parties involved on my behalf. Best regards”. (On September 30, 2025).

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to submit a formal response, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed 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 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 the entirety of the trademark CISCO FIREPOWER is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark CISCO FIREPOWER and confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks CISCO and FIREPOWER for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain, in this case “.com”, is typically ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 the 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 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 which would have been capable of showing that the Respondent was entitled to register the disputed domain name in his capacity of a "certified partner" or otherwise. Notably, when the Panel reviewed the website to which the disputed domain name redirects, it found nothing related per se to the Complainant.

The Panel, in accordance with its powers to consult matters of public record (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8), has checked the Wayback Machine ("www.archive.org") and found out that the disputed domain name, from its registration in 2015, has not been used until around September 2024, when it began being used to redirect Internet users to the website at "www.digitalnet.ca". In all, it looks to the Panel that the Respondent passively held the disputed domain name, based on the Complainant's trademarks CISCO, FIREPOWER and CISCO FIREPOWER, for 9 years, and then started to use it (or allowed it to be used) as a redirect to the competing website for its own benefit.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks CISCO, FIREPOWER and CISCO FIREPOWER in the field of IT services has been clearly established by the Complainant. The Panel thus finds that in all likelihood the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name opportunistically and in bad faith, to take advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights at some point in the future, particularly as the Respondent's field of activity is seemingly the same as the Complainant's, namely IT services and products relating to cyber security.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith since the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the disputed domain name's source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark CISCO and, further, is identical to its trademark CISCO FIREPOWER applied for before the registration date of the disputed domain name, indicates knowledge of the Complainant and further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

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, <ciscofirepower.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/
Edoardo Fano
Presiding Panelist

/Georges Nahitchevansky/
Georges Nahitchevansky
Panelist

/Christopher J. Pibus /
Christopher J. Pibus
Panelist
Date: November 21, 2025