

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Six Continents Hotels, Inc., Inter-Continental Hotels Corporation v. Crown Intercontinental Holidays, Crown Intercontinental Holidays Pvt Ltd
Case No. D2025-4766

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Six Continents Hotels, Inc., and Inter-Continental Hotels Corporation (together referred to as the “Complainant” below), United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, United States.

The Respondent is Crown Intercontinental Holidays, Crown Intercontinental Holidays Pvt Ltd, India, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <crownintercontinentalholidays.com> (the “Domain Name”) 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 November 18, 2025. On November 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On November 18, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the 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 November 19, 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 amendment to the Complaint on November 21, 2025. The Respondent sent an email on November 22, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 December 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 22, 2025. The Respondent sent four email

communications to the Center on December 3 and 22, 2025. However, the Respondent did not file any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of the panel appointment process on December 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on December 29, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainants are two subsidiaries of IHG Hotels & Resorts (“IHG”). IHG is a large hotel group that owns, manages, leases or franchises, some 6,845 hotels and 1,010,756 guest rooms in about 100 countries. IHG owns a portfolio of hotel brands including Crowne Plaza Hotels & Resorts, InterContinental Hotels & Resorts, Holiday Inn Hotels, Candlewood Suites and Regent Hotels & Resorts. IHG has a large hotel loyalty program in IHG Rewards Club.

The Complainant owns close to 150 trademark registrations in some 130 countries (including in India where the Respondent is situated) for trademarks in CROWNE PLAZA, e.g. U.S. Reg. No. 1,297,211 (registered September 18, 1984). The Complainant owns more than 160 registrations in some 87 countries (including in India where the Respondent is situated) for trademarks in INTERCONTINENTAL, e.g. U.S. Reg. No. 890,271 (registered April 28, 1970). The Complainant owns approximately 182 registrations in some 136 countries (including in India where the Respondent is situated) for trademarks in HOLIDAY INN, e.g. U.S. Reg. No. 592,539 (registered July 13, 1954).

The Complainant has registered numerous domain names relating to its trademarks, for example <crowneplaza.com> (created 1995), <intercontinental.com> (created 1997), and <holidayinn.com> (created 1995). The Complainant and its related companies have prevailed in proceedings under the UDRP Policy involving the above-mentioned trademarks.

The Domain Name was registered on July 3, 2025. The Domain Name resolves to a webpage that offers users a paid membership program for luxurious vacations worldwide, including hotel reservations, and by displaying among others the Complainant’s CROWNE PLAZA logo.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues with reference to previous UDRP decisions that its trademarks are well known in relation to hotels. The Complainant states that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks as the Domain Name incorporates the dominate parts of the Complainant’s trademarks INTERCONTINENTAL, CROWNE PLAZA and HOLIDAY INN, with minor alteration. The combination of the Complainant’s trademarks in the Domain Name does not prevent confusion in the minds of Internet visitors. The Complainant also argues that it supports a finding of confusing similarity that the Respondent appears to target the Complainant’s trademarks through the Domain Name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use and register its trademarks. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has never been commonly known by the Domain Name and has never acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the Domain Name. Although the name of the registrant is “Crown Intercontinental Holidays,” there is nothing to indicate that Respondent is actually known as “Crown Intercontinental Holidays”. On the contrary, the Complainant finds it is obvious that the Respondent has selected this name as a pretext for its cybersquatting. Registrants engaged in

cybersquatting provide often fake or inaccurate identities when registering domain names for impersonation. By engaging in such activity, the Respondent has failed to create a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy.

Given the global reach and popularity of the Complainant's services, the Complainant believes it is inconceivable that the Respondent chose the Domain Name without knowledge of the Complainant. This knowledge is also evident from the Respondent's use of the Domain Name, hereunder the display of the Complainant's logo on the Respondent's webpage. The same use of the Domain Name is clearly creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks, which constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal response to the Complaint but sent some informal emails in which the Respondent claimed not knowing that the Domain Name conflicts with the Complainant's trademarks but nonetheless offered to hand over the Domain Name by the first week of January, 2026.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademarks INTERCONTINENTAL, CROWNE PLAZA and HOLIDAY INN. The Domain Name incorporates with minor misspelling the dominant part of the Complainant's trademarks. The fact that the Respondent has combined the Complainant's three trademarks in the Domain Name does not prevent confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademarks. For the purpose of assessing under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain; see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark or more trademarks in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

The Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. With no

such evidence, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that the Respondent appears to have listed "Crown Intercontinental Holidays" as part of its cybersquatting in bad faith, see below.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

The Respondent knew of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. It follows from the fame of the Complainant, but also the use of the Domain Name, including the use of the Complainant's logo on the Respondent's webpage. The use of the Domain Name is also clear evidence of bad faith. The Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, to drive Internet traffic to the Respondent's webpage by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. See paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 the Domain Name <crownintercontinentalholidays.com> transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mathias Lilleengen/
Mathias Lilleengen
Sole Panelist
Date: January 7, 2026*