

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited v. Om Patel, Krox Technologies  
Case No. D2025-3883

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited, India, represented by Vutts & Associates LLP, India.

The Respondent is Om Patel, Krox Technologies, India.

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

The disputed domain name <citiustechus.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 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 24, 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 September 25, 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 30, 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 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 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Harini Narayanswamy as the sole panellist 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.

The Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center on October 31, 2025. On November 13, 2025, the Complainant made a request for suspending the proceeding to try for a settlement of the dispute with the Respondent. On December 17, 2025, the Complainant informed the Center that attempts for settlement had failed.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is in the business of health care technology consulting and uses the trademark CITIUSTECH. The Complainant was established under the name "Citius IT Solutions Private Limited" in 2005, and adopted the mark in the same year. The Complainant owns the domain name <citiustech.com> from which it operates its website.

The Complainant's portfolio of registered trademarks for the CITIUSTECH marks include among others:

CITIUSTECH Indian trademark registration No. 2700671, dated March 18, 2014, in class 9  
CITIUSTECH Indian trademark registration No. 2690440 dated March 3, 2014, in class 9  
CITIUSTECH United States of America ("United States" or "USA") trademark registration No. 4628676 dated April 2, 2014, in class 9 and 42

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 6, 2025. The disputed domain name has not been used by the Respondent and is merely parked with the Registrar, with pay-per-click ("PPC") links displayed in the parking page related to healthcare services offered by the Complainant.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it is a leading provider of healthcare technology services in India and in the United States of America. The Complainant contends that it is a pioneer in the area of healthcare analytics and has been using the CITIUSTECH mark continuously from the date of its adoption in 2005. The Complainant adds that the mark is also used as its umbrella trademark and is part of its corporate name.

The Complainant states that its subsidiary in United States was established on July 11, 2005. The Complainant contends that when it changed its name to "CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited" on October 10, 2015, the conspicuous portion of its name "CitiusTech" was retained.

The Complainant states that it has been funded by several investors including General Atlantic and has submitted evidence of a write up published in Forbes Magazine. Notably, the Complainant contends that from its inception till 2025 it has generated significant sales revenue amounting to INR 2,09,32,55,00,000 (USD 2,371,657,915) and has provided year-wise auditor certified sales revenue figures. The Complainant contends that it has spent large amounts each year to advertise and promote its mark and its total expenses for promotion and advertisements is about INR 1,81,62,00,000 and has also provided year-wise auditor certified figures of its promotional expenses.

The Complainant contends that it has received several awards including the "AWS INDUSTRY Partner of the Year for Healthcare & Life Sciences" Award for 2024. Among its many others recognitions and awards are: Top 100 Healthcare Technology Companies of 2022 by the Healthcare Technology Report, Star Performer in Everest Group PEAK Matrix® for Healthcare Payer Digital Service Provider 2023, and the 2015 Gold Stevie

Award at the 13<sup>th</sup> Annual American Business Awards in the category of “Most Innovative Tech Company of the Year”.

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the CITIUSTECH trademark. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the non-use of the disputed domain name indicates bad faith under the given circumstances.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not send a formal response to the Complaint in this proceeding. The Respondent however sent an informal email communication to the Center on October 31, 2025, which is reproduced here:

“Hello,  
We buy the domain for our company registration.  
If u have already name of this domain citiustechus so share with me details we will end from our side.  
And sorry for the delay reply I’m not much active this email. We buy this email purpose name is citius technical usa.”

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Three elements that need to be established by the Complainant, in order to obtain the remedy of transfer of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy are:

- (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 lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

### **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 provided evidence of its registered trademarks and has demonstrated rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the terms “us” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the term 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.

Paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy sets forth the following circumstances where a respondent may have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

- (i) Before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, the use by the respondent of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or
- (ii) The respondent, as an individual, business or other organization has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights or
- (iii) The respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name registration record shows the Respondent's name is Om Patel and the Respondent's business name is Krox Technologies. The material on record does not show that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or for any legitimate non-commercial fair use.

The Respondent in the informal email communication sent to the Center on October 31, 2025, has indicated that the disputed domain name was obtained for the Respondent's company. However, the name is evocative of the name of the Complainant's USA subsidiary.

The Complainant has confirmed in its Complaint that the Respondent has not been given any authorization or license to use the mark and is not an affiliate of the Complainant. Given the well-known nature of the Complainant's marks, and the Respondent's lack of affiliation with the Complainant, the logical inference that can be drawn under the circumstances, is that the disputed domain name references the Complainant's business and trademark.

The disputed domain name would misrepresent to an Internet user that it is operated by the Complainant or is associated or endorsed by the Complainant or its authorized licensees. Further, the Respondent has not provided evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name which under the circumstances, supports a finding that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, as understood under the Policy.

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 or demonstrated 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**

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panels finds that the mark is reputed and distinctive and has no dictionary meaning except as a source identifier of the Complainant's business. The evidence on record shows that the Complainant has used the mark extensively for several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The reputation of the Complainant's mark has been recognized in several UDRP decisions.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and incorporates the mark along with the term "us", which is a commonly used abbreviation for the United States. Thereby, use of the CITUSTECH mark with the letters "us" in the disputed domain name could potentially reference the Complainant's subsidiary in the United States. It has been consistently found that the registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

As already noted above by the Panel, the record shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a parked page containing PPC advertising links related to the Complainant's services. This constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Panels have further found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would 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 Respondent's failure to file a formal response, passive holding of the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and the entire set of circumstances of the case persuade the Panel that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

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 <citiustechus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Harini Narayanswamy/*

**Harini Narayanswamy**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 19, 2025