

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Microsoft Corporation v. Navaneet Uniyal, Nuance Dragon Software
Case No. D2025-3903

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Microsoft Corporation, United States of America, represented by Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is Navaneet Uniyal, Nuance Dragon Software, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <nuancedragonmedicalsupport.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 25, 2025. On September 25, 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 disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name, which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 2025, information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 29, 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 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Christelle Vaval as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 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

The Complainant, an American multinational technology company established in 1975, is one of the global leaders in personal-computer software, cloud computing services, and other online solutions. As part of its portfolio, the Complainant owns Nuance Communications Inc. ("Nuance"), a company specializing in conversational AI and ambient intelligence solutions across various industries, including healthcare. One of Nuance's business solutions is Dragon, which focuses on enhancing documentation and productivity. Among its services is "Dragon Medical One", an award-winning speech recognition clinical application designed specifically for the healthcare sector.

The Complainant owns NUANCE trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including the United States of America Trademark Registration No. 75811758 (registered on September 5, 2000), United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00900254615 (registered on February 24, 1999) and Australia Trademark Registration No. 829690 (registered on March 29, 2000). The Complainant also holds trademark rights in the mark DRAGON across various jurisdictions such as United States of America Trademark Registration No. 6292101 (registered on March 16, 2021), the United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00900524538 (registered on March 9, 1999) and Australia Trademark Registration No. 737276 (registered on June 19, 1997).

The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name <nuancedragonmedicalsupport.com> on July 27, 2022, which is well after the Complainant's trademarks were registered. The Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to active websites and has been used to send fraudulent emails to the public, including the customers and/or partners of the Complainant, aimed at impersonating the Complainant and/or for phishing attempts.

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:

1. Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant asserts ownership of the NUANCE and DRAGON trademarks, registered across multiple jurisdictions globally. It argues that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademarks, as it fully incorporates the NUANCE and DRAGON marks along with the addition of the non-distinctive and descriptive terms "medical support", which does not diminish the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant further argues that the addition of the generic Top-Level domain should be disregarded in the test for confusing similarity, as it is a standard requirement for domain name registration and does not affect the overall assessment of similarity.

Any Internet user is likely to assume that the Disputed Domain Name is linked to the Complainant's trademarks.

2. No rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not licensed or permitted to use the NUANCE and DRAGON trademarks or register a domain name incorporating them.

The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name after the Complainant had established and registered its trademarks. Given the well-known status of the Complainant, the Respondent must surely have known of the Complainant and its rights when registering the Disputed Domain Name.

The Respondent is not using the Disputed Domain Name for legitimate or noncommercial or fair purposes, as the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive webpage, showing no evidence of use or preparations for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Disputed Domain Name is associated with an email address used for impersonating the Complainant and/or conducting phishing attempts, further demonstrating the lack of legitimate interest.

Finally, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or any corresponding name.

3. Registered and used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. In particular: (i) the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive webpage (non-use/passive holding); (ii) the Respondent employed a privacy protection service to hide its identity; and (iii) the Disputed Domain Name is associated with an email address that aims to impersonate the Complainant and/or conduct phishing attempts by soliciting financial information.

The Complainant submits that this conduct evidences targeting of the Complainant, disrupts its business, and seeks to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The case record shows the Center verified the Complaint's formal compliance and formally commenced the proceeding on September 30, 2025 (with a 20-day Response deadline that fell on October 20, 2025). The Center then notified the Respondent of default on October 21, 2025.

The Center employed all reasonably available means to contact the Respondent, pursuant to paragraph 2(a) of the UDRP Rules.

The record reflects service consistent with the Rules and WIPO Supplemental Rules. In the absence of a Response, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default (Rules, paragraph 14), as the Center's default notice also notes.

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 entirety of the marks NUANCE and DRAGON are reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms “medical” and “support” 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 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 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 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 (Policy, paragraph 4(c)). Specifically:

1. The Respondent has not demonstrated any use of the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive webpage, and the record shows use for phishing/impersonation emails. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.
2. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or any name corresponding to it.
3. The records show that the Disputed Domain Name has been configured for fraudulent email activity aimed at impersonating the Complainant and soliciting financial information. Such conduct reflects an intent to divert consumers for commercial gain through misleading means.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing, or other types of fraud, 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

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 notes that the Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Name with the intention of disrupting the business of the Complainant, and to attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks NUANCE and DRAGON.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered after the Complainant registered its NUANCE and DRAGON trademarks and fully incorporates these marks, merely adding the descriptive terms "medical" and "support." This indicates a likely intention to target the Complainant's business activities. Furthermore, the Disputed Domain Name implies an association with the Complainant's "Dragon Medical One" product, thereby leveraging the Complainant's established reputation and goodwill.

The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant demonstrates the intention to create confusion among internet users by falsely representing the Respondent as being affiliated with the Complainant. The fraudulent emails were designed to create confusion for commercial gain by deceiving the recipients into providing sensitive financial information.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <nuancedragonmedicalsupport.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christelle Vaval/

Christelle Vaval

Sole Panelist

Date: November 7, 2025