

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tata Motors Passenger Vehicles Limited v. Faiyaz Jan
Case No. D2025-4596

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Faiyaz Jan, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tatasierra.com> is registered with Domainshype.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).¹

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 (Domain Admin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 10, 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 11, 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 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules,

¹On November 7, 2025, the Center received the Registrant information from BigRock Solutions Ltd which also confirmed the lock of the disputed domain name. The Panel’s decision is applicable to both Domainshype.com, LLC and BigRock Solutions Ltd.

paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar as the sole panelist in this matter on December 16, 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 was formerly the wholly owned subsidiary of Tata Motors Limited, which is India's largest automobile company. Through certain schemes of amalgamation and demerger approved by the National Company Law Tribunal in India in October 2025, the Complainant was merged into Tata Motors Limited and thereafter the name of Tata Motors Limited was also through the scheme of amalgamation and demerger changed to Tata Motors Passenger Vehicles Limited as it stands today. The Complainant is involved in the business of design, development, manufacture, and sale of passenger vehicles within India and abroad and some of the notable passenger vehicles include Safari and Indica. The Complainant launched the vehicle "TATA SIERRA" in 1991 and signaled for relaunch of the Electrical Vehicle (EV) version of TATA Sierra in the auto expo 2020. In Bharat Mobility Global Expo 2025, the new version of TATA SIERRA was showcased. The Complainant has submitted evidence of its advertising and promotional materials related to Tata Sierra vehicle to the Panel.

The trademark "TATA Sierra" has been registered since August 1, 1991, under Class 12 bearing trademark number 555591 by TATA Engineering and Locomotive Company Limited.

The Complainant claims that the term 'TATA' is an iconic brand and is an important element of the corporate name of several companies belonging to TATA Group of Companies and that the Complainant is a part of the TATA Group of Companies. The Complainant further states that the trademark "TATA" enjoys immense goodwill and reputation and that it has been declared as a well-known trademark in India and the Complainant is the licensee of the said "TATA" mark.

The Respondent is Faiyaz Jan allegedly from India who is the registrant of the disputed domain name <tatasierra.com>, registered on November 3, 2024. According to the evidence provided with the Complaint, the disputed domain resolved to a parked site, which included pay per-click ("PPC") sponsored links, related displaying TATA marks and offered the said domain for sale at 4999 USD. Currently the disputed domain resolves to a website with PPC links displaying "TATA" related content with no reference to sale price.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends the disputed domain name is (i) identical to its "TATA SIERRA" mark; (ii) the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and is not connected with the Complainant or authorized to use its mark; (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, as Internet users looking for the Complainant are being diverted to the Respondent's site based on its mark. The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Three elements need to be established by the Complainant under paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy to obtain transfer of the disputed domain name, these are:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

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 is satisfied that the Complainant has been able to show its rights in respect of the trademark "TATA" and "TATA SIERRA". However, the Panel notes that, according to the online records of the Indian Trademarks Registry, the Indian trademark bearing registration number 555591 for the trademark "TATA SIERRA" specifically being relied upon by the Complainant, currently reflects "TATA ENGINEERING AND LOCOMOTIVE COMPANY LIMITED" as the registered proprietor. Publicly available official records indicate that "TATA ENGINEERING AND LOCOMOTIVE COMPANY LIMITED" was the erstwhile name of Tata Motors Limited, which name has also been since changed to Tata Motors Passenger Vehicles Limited as it stands today pursuant to the schemes of amalgamation and demerger as narrated in the Factual Background paragraphs hereinabove and thereby the Complainant herein has become the successor in title to the said trademark. Accordingly, it would have been appropriate if the Complainant could have brought out the above details and factual matrix to ex-facie outline its rights in the "TATA SIERRA" trademark rather than having to leave it to the Panel to ascertain the same from the available documentation. Furthermore, the claim of the Complainant that it is the licensee of the well-known trademark 'TATA' is also not substantiated by any specific documentary evidence. Nevertheless, this Panel is convinced from the facts and other evidence relied upon by the Complainant that it has been incorporated with the word 'TATA' as part of its corporate name under which it has been conducting its business for several decades thereby establishing its bona fide rights in the 'TATA' trademark, independent of its claim of being a licensee of the trademark 'TATA'.

Be that as it may, the Panel finds that 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, the Complainant has established prima facie that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name <tatasierra.com>, by demonstrating the following:

- (i) that the Respondent is not related in any way with the Complainant;
- (ii) that neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark TATA SIERRA or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant; and
- (iii) the Respondent used the disputed domain name for a parking page with third party PPC links that divert traffic to misappropriate the reputation of the Complainant's trademark.

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 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 ought to have constructive notice of the TATA Group and the Complainant's well-known trademark, which is further evidenced by the display of PPC links containing TATA cars in the disputed domain name. This unequivocally shows that the Respondent was very well-aware of the Complainant, and the registration of the disputed domain name was to unjustly enrich from the Complainant's goodwill and reputation. The bad faith is further evidenced from the fact that the Respondent had offered the disputed domain name for sale at a very high rate (Annexure 2).

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 <tatasierra.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar/
Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar
Sole Panelist
Date: December 30, 2025