

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cisco Technology Inc. v. Dynamic IT Network Case No. D2025-3825

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 Dynamic IT Network, India.

2. The Disputed Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <ciscorouterswitch.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (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 confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 September 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu, Georges Nahitchevansky, and Shwetaree Majumder as panelists in this matter on November 7, 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, a California based corporation, is a worldwide technology company providing a wide array of products and services ranging from networking and communications equipment and software, including telephone communications systems, routers, video conferencing systems, and collaboration products and services, to financing services, retail store services, training and certification programs and blogs. The Complainant provides products and services to a diverse customer base that spans all industries and includes individual consumers, small to medium sized businesses, enterprises, service providers and governmental entities. The Complainant is a public company traded on NASDAQ, listed in the Dow Jones Industrial Average, and has more than 75,000 employees in countries throughout the world.

The Complainant grants express authorizations to its partners, through partnership agreements, in order to permit them to sell CISCO new branded products, and to use the CISCO trademark.

The Complainant owns numerous worldwide trademark rights for or including CISCO, such as the following:

- the Indian trademark registration number 1227391 for CISCO (word), registered on August 27, 2003, covering goods in International Class 9;
- the European Union Trademark Registration number 000644732 for CISCO (word), filed on October 7, 1997, registered on November 5, 1999, covering goods and services in International Classes 9, 36, 42; and
- the United States Trademark Registration number 1542339 for CISCO (word), filed on June 13, 1988, registered on June 6, 1989, covering goods in International Class 9.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names incorporating CISCO, such as <cisco.com> registered on May 14, 1987, <cisco.us>, or <cisco.mobi>.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on April 9, 2025, and has been used, including at the time of filing of the Complaint, to resolve to a commercial website promoting purported CISCO branded products, as well as a number of products from the Complainant's competitors. On the website at the Disputed Domain Name it is noted that the products promoted are "sourced directly from Cisco-authorized distributors" and that the Respondent is engaged in "wholesale trading" of various goods, including "Cisco Routers". The website also states that "[w]e provide we also offer a wide range of brands Cisco, Nexus, Juniper, Avaya, Hp, IBM, Dell power connector, Dell Power Edge And Etc.". The website lacks a disclaimer that accurately discloses the relationship (in fact the lack thereof) with the Complainant.

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 it has used its famous CISCO trademark to market and sell its products since 1984. The Complainant has expended considerable resources in promoting and advertising its CISCO products and services, and in building valuable goodwill in its CISCO brand. As a consequence of such longstanding use and extensive promotional efforts, the CISCO trademark can be considered an internationally famous trademark and has been found to be "well-known" and famous in prior UDRP decisions.

In particular, the Complainant argues that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its well-known CISCO trademark and domain names since the Disputed Domain Name fully incorporates the CISCO mark, as the dominant and distinctive element of the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent's inclusion of the

generic terms “router” and “switch” only compounds the confusing similarity of the Disputed Domain Name to CISCO trademark, particularly given that the Complainant manufactures both routers and switches.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name as the Respondent (i) is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, (ii) has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark and is not a licensed reseller of the Complainant’s products or an authorized partner of the Complainant, and (iii) does not use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, because the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website that is designed to mislead Internet users to believe that the site is operated by an authorized seller of the Complainant’s products.

The Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith as the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, mainly because: the registration of the CISCO trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name with nearly 20 years; the allegations made by the Respondent on the website under the Disputed Domain Name falsely suggest to the Internet users that the Respondent is an authorized distributor of the Complainant’s products whereas the Respondent does not have any authorization to sell Complainant’s new products or to use the CISCO trademarks – and the sale of unauthorized products, or products that differ in quality, capacity, and functionality from authorized resellers, will irreparably harm consumers, as well as the Complainant; and the Respondent advertises and promotes third party competitor products and thus, it is using the Complainant’s mark to direct consumers to competing products.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in 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 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 mark CISCO 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 other terms, here “router” and “switch”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements 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 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 Disputed Domain Name is used in connection with a website purportedly providing goods of the Complainant as well as those of Complainant’s competitors, without any disclaimer or authorization from the Complainant. In all, the promotion of competitor products along with CISCO branded goods, the lack of any disclaimer and the misleading content on the website at the Disputed Domain Name which falsely suggests to Internet users that the website is authorized or approved by or at least affiliated with the Complainant cannot be considered “fair”. It certainly does not provide Respondent with any rights or legitimate interests for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.

Further, the Panel notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, which combines the Complainant’s well-known trademark CISCO with the dictionary terms “router” and “switch” which are strongly associated with the Complainant’s business, suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith. The Complainant’s trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by more than three decades and is highly distinctive and well-known worldwide. In addition, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, which reproduces the Complainant’s mark together with dictionary terms associated with the Complainant’s business (i.e., “router” and “switch”) indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant. Lastly, the use of the Disputed Domain Name for a website offering Complainant’s products and those of its competitors further supports that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name opportunistically to take advantage of Complainant’s rights in its CISCO mark.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt “to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] website or location” is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s well-known trademark, and that the website at the Disputed Domain Name promotes goods purported to be CISCO branded goods, along with those of Complainant’s competitors, without displaying any disclaimer disclosing the relationship (in fact the lack thereof) between the Respondent and the Complainant gives rise that Respondent has acted in bad faith. Indeed, in this Panel’s view, the Respondent has likely intended to attract Internet users to its website at the Disputed Domain Name for Respondent’s commercial gain as consumers who access Respondent’s website may be confused and believe that such website is held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated with or related to the Complainant.

Further underscoring Respondent’s bad faith is not only Respondent’s failure to participate in these proceedings, but its use of an inaccurate/incomplete postal address for the registration of the Disputed Domain Name (given that Written Notice could not be delivered to the Respondent by courier service).

Lastly, previous UDRP panels have found that the mere registration of a domain name, as is the case here, that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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

/Marilena Comanescu/

Marilena Comanescu

Presiding Panelist

/Georges Nahitchevansky/

Georges Nahitchevansky

Panelist

/Shwetasree Majumder /

Shwetasree Majumder

Panelist

Date: November 19, 2025