

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. userdc dger
Case No. D2025-4327

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is userdc dger, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syngentasales.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 22, 2025. On October 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 23, 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) 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 27, 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 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Meera Chature Sankhari 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Syngenta Crop Protection AG, is a global, science-based agtech company with 30,000 employees in over 90 countries, dedicated to the purpose of bringing plant potential to life. The Complainant claims to help millions of farmers around the world grow safe and nutritious food while taking care of the planet. The Complainant also claims to offer several products including agrochemicals for crop protection, vegetable and flower seeds.

The Complainant has obtained international registration of the word mark SYNGENTA under Registration No. 732663 dated March 8, 2000, designating several jurisdictions including Kenya, France, United Kingdom, Iceland, Germany, China, the Russian Federation, and Viet nam, among others. The Complainant has also secured registration of the mark SYNGENTA (registration no. 3036058) in multiple classes in the United States of America on December 27, 2005, which is renewed and valid.

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain names including <syngenta.com>, <syngenta.us>, <syngenta.com.au>, <syngenta.fr>, <syngenta.cn>, <syngenta.co>, <syngenta.co.uk>, <syngenta.de>, <syngenta.ru>, and <syngenta.vn>.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 5, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to an active website purportedly offering agrochemical goods.

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 its registered trademark SYNGENTA. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name contains the trademark SYNGENTA in whole and is only differentiated by the term "sales" which is generic in nature. This is clearly meant to confuse the public into thinking that the disputed domain name is owned and operated by the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant, nor has it authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's registered trademark.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is resolving to a website which claims to be selling Syngenta products and is also exploiting the Complainant's mark to promote unaffiliated third-party merchandise. The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name is in and of itself potentially damaging to its reputation. The Complainant submits the following factors about the Respondent's website that contribute to the impression that it is being used for dubious activity i.e. (a) it contains blank pages and inconsistent information; (b) the "About Us" page does not resolve to content; (c) the "Contact Us" page includes a residential address in the United States but shows a map with its location in China; (d) the privacy policy is dated one year before the domain name was registered; and (d) non-functioning email address for customer inquiries. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name uses the SYNGENTA trademark to promote the unauthorized sale of unverified SYNGENTA products as well as third-party products. The Complainant further submits that such use is intended to

confuse and mislead the public by passing off the disputed domain name as being associated with the Complainant, for financial gain.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has been the registrant in other domain name dispute cases and thus has an established pattern of bad faith registration. The Complainant further states that a cease-and-desist letter was sent to the Respondent via the Registrar's contact form on October 15, 2025; however, no response has been received to date. Additionally, the said letter was also sent to the email address published on the Respondent's website, which returned an error notification, that the "email could not be delivered". Thus, a non-response to a notification of infringement can be considered an element of bad faith.

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 and 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.

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

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 as applicable to this case 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, through the disputed domain name, is offering unverified SYNGENTA products as well as third-party products, and is thereby seeking to derive commercial advantage from the Complainant's trademark. Such use is further misleading and is likely to confuse the public into believing that there is some association between the Complainant's mark and the disputed domain name.

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. The Panel finds that the Respondent has been shown to have an established pattern of bad faith conduct, see e.g. *Les Parfumeries Fragonard v. userdc dger*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3115](#). In fact, the Panel cannot help but note the similarities in pattern, including selling the products of the legitimate trademark owner alongside third-party products, as well as the use of the images of such legitimate products of the trademark owner.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed 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 <syngentasales.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Meera Chature Sankhari/
Meera Chature Sankhari
Sole Panelist
Date: December 11, 2025