

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Huy Nguyen Quang
Case No. D2025-3880

1. The Parties

Complainant is Syngenta Crop Protection AG, Switzerland, represented by Michelle O'Neil, Switzerland.

Respondent is Huy Nguyen Quang, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <syngenta-hang-hieu.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 24, 2025. On September 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 25, 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 sent an email communication to Complainant on September 26, 2025, confirming the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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

Complainant is a global, science-based agtech company with 30,000 employees in 90 countries dedicated to the purpose of bringing plant potential to life. Complainant helps millions of farmers around the world to grow safe and nutritious food, while taking care of the planet. Complainant's products include agrochemicals for crop protection as well as vegetable and flower seeds. Complainant maintains a website at <syngenta.com> and owns numerous other domain names which include the SYNGENTA name, such as <syngenta-hanghieu.com>.

Complainant has the following registrations of its SYNGENTA Mark:

International Trademark Registration No. 732663 SYNGENTA registered March 8, 2000 in classes 01, 02, 05, 07, 08, 09, 10, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41, and 42, with designations in Kenya, France, the United Kingdom, Iceland, Germany, China, the Russian Federation, and Viet Nam among others.

United States Trademark Registration No. 3,036,058 SYNGENTA registered December 27, 2005 in classes 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41, and 42.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on November 26, 2024 and resolves to a website which is an exact copy of one of Complainant's official websites, namely <syngenta-hanghieu.com>.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name contains the entirety of the SYNGENTA Mark and also includes the entirety of one of Complainant's official websites "syngenta-hanghieu.com" with the exception of an extra hyphen. Complainant further contends that "Hang Hieu" in Vietnamese means "branded goods" and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Complainant submits that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, nor is Respondent authorized to use the SYNGENTA Mark. Complainant further submits that Respondent has not used the Disputed Domain Name in a bona fide offering of goods and services or in any legitimate manner. Complainant further submits that Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant alleges that the fraudulent website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves solicits phone numbers from visitors under the guise of a "login" process and constitutes phishing.

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainant's assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainant to verify that the three essential elements of the claims are

met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following three essential elements:

- i) that the Disputed Domain Name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the SYNGENTA Mark in which Complainant has rights;
- ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and,
- iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1 states that registration is prima facie evidence of Complainant having enforceable rights in the SYNGENTA Mark.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the SYNGENTA Mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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 SYNGENTA Mark and the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The entirety of the SYNGENTA Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the SYNGENTA Mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, the phrase “Hang-Hieu” and additional hyphens, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the SYNGENTA Mark for 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the SYNGENTA Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available 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.

Panels have held that the use of a disputed domain name for illegitimate activity, here phishing and impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainant to show bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name:

(i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the SYNGENTA Mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; or

(ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent Complainant as the owner of the SYNGENTA Mark from reflecting the SYNGENTA Mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Disputed Domain Name, you [Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with SYNGENTA Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

The Panel finds that the actions of Respondent meet the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a disputed domain name for illegitimate activity, here phishing and impersonation/passing off, constitute bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent’s registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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-hang-hieu.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Richard W. Page/

Richard W. Page

Sole Panelist

Date: November 3, 2025