

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. khan khan, asia karachi
Case No. D2025-4244

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Syngenta Crop Protection AG, Switzerland, internally represented.

The Respondent is khan khan, asia karachi, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syngenta-pvt-ltd.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 16, 2025. On October 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 16, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, 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 23, 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on November 22, 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 is an internationally active Swiss company that primarily provides agrochemicals for crop protection, as well as vegetable and flower seeds. It employs approximately 30,000 people and operates in about 90 countries worldwide. In addition, the Complainant has a business in India under the name Syngenta India Private Limited with the website at “www.syngenta.co.in”.

The Complainant is the owner of the SYNGENTA trademark. Among many others, the Complainant is the registered owner of the International Trademark Registration No. 732663, registered on March 8, 2000, for SYNGENTA, covering protection for a large number of goods and services in classes 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41, and 42, and designating many jurisdictions around the world. According to additional documents provided in the Complaint, the Complainant also owns numerous national trademark registrations for SYNGENTA, including in Pakistan.

The Complainant further owns a large number of domain names consisting of or comprising its SYNGENTA trademark, such as <syngenta.com>.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Pakistan.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 23, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the SYNGENTA trademark and promoting financial opportunities by allegedly offering users money for watching advertisements.

On October 7, 2025, the Complainant send a cease and desist letter to the Respondent claiming a transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent replied on the same day and asserted that it has acquired the disputed domain name for its “licensed pesticide business, which operates legally and independently”. The Respondent further alleged that there was “no intention to misrepresent or infringe” the Complainant’s rights and indicated willingness to “discuss and resolve” the matter amicably. A follow-up email sent by the Complainant on October 8, 2025 remained unanswered.

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. In particular, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent was involved in a previous case filed by the Complainant, *Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. khan khan, asia karachi*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3819](#) regarding the domain name <syngenta-group-invest.com>.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. See section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

For the evaluation of this case, the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

The entirety of the SYNGENTA 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here "-pvt-ltd" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such addition 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent's assertion, made in its email communication to the Complainant on October 7, 2025, that it operates a legal and independent pesticide business and its expressed willingness to "discuss and resolve" the matter amicably. The Panel further observes that the use of the disputed domain name, which resolves to a website promoting financial opportunities by allegedly offering money for viewing advertisements, has nothing to do with the claimed pesticide business. Moreover, considering the Complainant has a business in India under the name Syngenta India Private Limited, Internet users may think the disputed domain name has some connection with the Complainant.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes the Complainant's international presence and reputation in the agrochemical and seeds sector. In the Panel's view, it is not credible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant or its SYNGENTA mark at the time of registration. The Respondent's explanation offered prior to the commencement of this administrative proceeding – namely that the disputed domain name was acquired for a legal and independent pesticide business – is unsupported by any evidence. There is also no explanation from the Respondent regarding its choice of "Syngenta" in the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Respondent previously registered another domain name <syngenta-group-invest.com> which incorporates the Complainant's widely known SYNGENTA trademark. The Panel concludes that the Respondent more likely selected the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and with the intention of targeting the Complainant and its SYNGENTA trademark.

The Panel further finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a website promoting supposed financial opportunities, allegedly offering users money for watching advertisements. Such use bears no connection to the Respondent's claimed pesticide business and instead exploits the disputed domain name's inherent association with the Complainant's SYNGENTA trademark to attract Internet users for commercial gain.

Overall, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <syngenta-pvt-ltd.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: December 6, 2025