

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tata Motors Limited v. EYAH EYA MOAZ
Case No. D2025-4594

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tata Motors Limited, India, represented by DePenning & DePenning, India.

The Respondent is EYAH EYA MOAZ, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tatamotors.online> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 6, 2025. On November 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 7, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Service by onamae.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 7, 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 10, 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 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on December 9, 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 belongs to Tata Group, one of the India's largest automobile companies and among the top five commercial vehicle manufacturers in the world.

The Complainant and the Tata Group (Tata Sons Private Limited) hold a portfolio of trademarks for TATA MOTORS and TATA. By way of example:

TATA MOTORS, Indian trademark registration number 1241123, registered on October 3, 2003.

TATA MOTORS, Indian trademark registration number 4159301, registered on April 26, 2019; and

TATA, Bangladeshi trademark registration number 15303, registered on November 16, 2016.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names composed with TATA MOTORS trademarks. Such as, <tatamotors.in>, registered on April 28, 2014, and <tatamotors.com>, registered on May 9, 2002.

The disputed domain name <tatamotors.online> was registered on July 16, 2025, and directed to a website that features the Complainant's trademark and logo, a welcome statement and, an access and registration forms. The disputed domain name is currently inactive.

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 it has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to apply for any domain name incorporating TATA MOTORS and that Respondent's intent was to misappropriate the reputation of its trademarks and conduct fraudulent activities.

Besides, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent knew that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark in an attempt to usurp the Complainant's reputation to diver Internet traffic to the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark 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 was registered and is being used in bad faith.

There are no exceptional circumstances within paragraph 5(f) of the Rules to prevent the Panel from determining the dispute based upon the Complaint, notwithstanding the failure of the Respondent to file a Response. Under paragraph 14(a) of the Rules in the event of such a “default” the Panel is still required “to proceed with a decision on the complaint”, whilst under paragraph 14(b) it “shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate”. This dispute resolution procedure is accepted by the domain name registrant as a condition of registration.

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 identical 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.

While the Policy in paragraph 4(c) takes into consideration the three illustrative examples of Respondent rights, the Complainant has evidenced that none is met in this case.

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. Indeed, the circumstances of the case lead the Panel to conclude that the Respondent attempted to impersonate the Complainant. As such, the composition of the disputed domain name, coupled with the reproduction Complainant’s trademark on the Respondent’s website purporting to be the Complainant’s, indicates the Respondent’s intention to mislead Internet users.

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 falls in the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b) (iv) of the Policy: intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. That is to say, the disputed domain name attempts to bait the Internet users into a website which they might think is an official site of the Complainant when this is not the case.

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 found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

On balance, the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name due to its reputation and distinctiveness in the automotive industry. Besides, the Complainant's mark and logo are reproduced in the Respondent's website as a mean to take advantage of the goodwill and attractiveness of the Complainant's trademark. Thus, the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its trademarks, and the registration and use were 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 <tatamotors.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Moreno-Torres/

Manuel Moreno-Torres

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025