

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Khadi & Village Industries Commission v. Jay Patel, Meddatascience inc
Case No. D2025-4455

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Khadi & Village Industries Commission, India, represented by Fidus Law Chambers, India.

The Respondent is Jay Patel, Meddatascience inc, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <khadigram.org> 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 October 29, 2025. On October 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 29, 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 October 30, 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 November 4, 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 November 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 1, 2025.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on December 8, 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 a statutory body formed in April 1957 by the Government of India, by virtue of an Indian Act of Parliament, the “Khadi and Village Industries Commission Act” of 1956. The Complainant supports employment in about 248,000 villages in India, and its programs promote associated products under the trademark KHADI.

The Complainant owns many registrations for the trademark KHADI in India, including trademark Nos 2851542, 2851543, and 2851544 for goods in classes 24, 25, and 26 respectively and all registered on November 27, 2014, with first use dated September 25, 1956. It has also obtained trademark registrations for the mark KHADI INDIA in other jurisdictions including Registration No. UK00003601728 in the United Kingdom, registered on October 8, 2021, and Registration No. 018075754 for the mark KHADI in the European Union, registered on February 8, 2024. It filed for trademark registration for a mark including the term KHADI in the United States on January 29, 2021, and then on subsequent dates as well.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 6, 2025, and does not resolve to any 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.

The Complainant is engaged in the promotion and development of the KHADI brand, and products under the KHADI trademarks through the institutions certified by the Complainant. The Complainant authorizes various retail sellers, organizations, societies and institutions to sell products under its KHADI trademarks. In order to be listed as an authorized user of the KHADI trademarks for the purpose of sales and promotions of KHADI certified products and services, each organization must apply for recognition through the Khadi Institutions Registration & Certification Sewa (KIRCS). The Complainant has collaborated with fashion brands and designers to promote KHADI branded clothing at various events. It points out that its KHADI brand has been declared well known by various judicial and quasi-judicial authorities in India, and that the trademark KHADI has been added to the list of well-known trademarks by the Trademarks Registry of India. The Complainant points to past Panel decisions that have recognised the Complainant’s rights in the KHADI mark against Respondents based in the United States.

The Complainant points out that the disputed domain name wholly subsumes the Complainant’s trademark KHADI, and is clearly recognizable within it. The Complainant adds that the additional term “gram” is a Hindi word that means “village”, and therefore its use in the disputed domain name is a deliberate attempt to create a link with the Complainant’s trading name and address, and create the impression that the disputed domain name hosts an official website. This use is, according to the Complainant, a clearly calculated attempt to mislead internet users into believing that their goods are associated with/originate from the Complainant, when factually, that is not the case. The Complainant points to Section 1.8 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), which says the relevant requirement is that the Complainant’s mark be recognisable in the disputed domain which is the case here.

The Complainant further contends that the resolving of the disputed domain name to a “Launching Soon” page does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. There is no demonstrable preparation to use or actual use of the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. Additionally, the Complainant says that it has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use any of its trademarks in any way. The Complainant contends that the unlicensed and unauthorized use of a domain name incorporating its trademark is intended to misleadingly divert consumers and to tarnish the trademark of the Complainant. The Complainant concludes that it has, therefore, established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent to produce evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that it has satisfied the second element in this manner.

The Complainant then contends that the fact that the Respondent has failed to host any content at the disputed domain name or use it for any bona fide offering of goods or services demonstrates that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith and with the mala fide intention to extract some commercial advantage from the Complainant. The Complainant adds that the mere registration by an unaffiliated entity of a domain name that incorporates a famous or widely known trademark, which the Complainant contends KHADI is, amounts to bad faith registration. The Complainant says that what it refers to as the fame of its KHADI mark and its unique qualities make it extremely unlikely the Respondent registered the disputed domain name independently and without knowledge of the Complainant’s rights. The Respondent was in any case obliged to make good faith efforts to avoid registering a domain name that violates pre-existing trademark rights of a third party.

In terms of the passive holding doctrine, the Complainant points out that its KHADI trademark has been in use since 1956 and has been declared a famous trademark in India and accepted as such by previous Panels. It exports its products, inter alia to the United States of America, where it has also applied for registration of the KHADI mark. The Complainant says that for those reasons the Respondent registered the disputed domain name solely to benefit from the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant’s trademark KHADI, and to take advantage of those rights. The Complainant contends that therefore the disputed domain name was registered and used in 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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 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 Respondent has not replied to any of the contentions made by the Complainant. The latter has not authorized the Respondent to use its long-established, widely reputed and distinctive KHADI registered trademark in any manner. There is nothing to indicate that the Respondent has any prior or recognized rights to the term KHADI and the mark is in no way related to the name of the Respondent. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website which would explain or justify the incorporation of the mark KHADI in the disputed domain name. There is thus nothing before the Panel that suggests that the Respondent might have any right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

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 has registered a domain name that incorporates the well-established, distinctive and widely known trademark KHADI, in which the Respondent has no rights. The composition of the disputed domain name suggests that the Respondent was well aware of the rights of the Complainant in the KHADI mark since it includes the term “gram” which translates to “village” in Hindi, which is closely connected with the activities the Complainant conducts under the KHADI mark. In any case, the reputation of the KHADI mark is such that a simple trademark or Internet search would have revealed the Complainant’s use of that mark for its village-originated goods both in India and in other countries including the United States.

The fact that at present the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website is no bar to a finding of bad faith use, as has been recognized by previous UDRP panels. It is in any case difficult to imagine any website to which the disputed domain name might link conducting an activity that would not take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s reputation in the KHADI mark and mislead consumers.

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 <khadigram.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: December 22, 2025