

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cyient Limited v. Ellen Walter
Case No. D2025-4117

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cyient Limited, India, represented by Saikrishna & Associates, India.

The Respondent is Ellen Walter, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cyientt.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 8, 2025. On October 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 9, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 20, 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 October 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 October 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on November 27, 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.

On December 5, 2025, the Panel issued a Procedural Order No.1 requesting the Complainant to modify section IX (Mutual Jurisdiction) in its Complaint in order to adhere to paragraph 3(b)(xii) of the Rules by December 8, 2025, and the Respondent was invited to submit comments on the Complainant's submission by December 11, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Complainant submitted an amended Complaint to the Center by email. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is an engineering and technology solutions company. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for CYIENT such as:

- Indian trademark registration No. 2776066, registered on July 17, 2014; and
- Indian trademark registration No. 5152065, registered on September 28, 2021.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 23, 2024 and the evidence reflects that it has been used for sending email communications impersonating an employee of the Complainant. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the letter "t," which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no bona fide use or preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with legitimate offerings of goods or services as the disputed domain name was used to impersonate an employee of Complainant, and as the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Emails were sent impersonating an employee of the Complainant. The Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademark. The Respondent used a privacy service. There is no bona fide use or preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with legitimate offerings of goods or services.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 mark is reproduced 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.

The Panel finds that the addition of the letter "t" 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed, 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

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 is using the disputed domain name in connection with an email address that is part of a fraudulent scheme. Emails were sent to a client replicating the name of the Complainant's employee and requesting payment of invoices. The disputed domain name was registered a decade after the first registration of the Complainant's trademark.

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 illegitimate activity here, claimed, phishing and impersonation/passing off, 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 <cyientt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: December 18, 2025