

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Shijun

Case No. D2026-0128

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Shijun, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syngentainsecticide.com> is registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co., Ltd (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 13, 2026. On January 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 15, 2026, 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 (Not listed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 19, 2026, 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 January 20, 2026.

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 January 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Charles Gielen as the sole panelist in this matter on February 24, 2026. 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 global, science-based agricultural technology company with 30,000 employees active in over 90 countries. The products include agrochemicals for crop protection as well as vegetable and flower seeds. The Complainant uses the trade mark SYNGENTA and operates the domain name <syngenta.com>.

The Complainant holds a portfolio of registrations for the trade mark SYNGENTA. This portfolio includes among other:

- International Registration No. 732663 registered on March 8, 2000 for goods in classes 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 29, 30, 31 and 32 and services in classes 35, 36, 41, and 42 and covering numerous countries;
- United States of America Registration No. 3036058 registered on December 27, 2005 for goods in classes 1, 5, 16, and 31 and services in classes 35, 36, 41, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 17, 2025 and resolves to a website that purports to sell the Complainant's products, primarily Syngenta Professional Solutions products such as Advion cockroach gel.

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 the Complainant's trade mark. It contains the exact trade mark of the Complainant with the only difference being the insertion of the descriptive term "insecticide" after this mark. The Complainant refers to UDRP panels that have consistently held that the addition of a descriptive or generic term related to a complainant's business does not avoid confusing similarity and may in fact increase confusion. Where the relevant trade mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant, nor is the Respondent authorized to use the Complainant's registered trade mark.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

With respect to the bad faith registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that it was clearly registered with full knowledge of the Complainant's well-known SYNGENTA trade mark. Given the global reputation of this trade mark and its direct association with insecticides, the Respondent's awareness of the SYNGENTA trade mark at the time of registration can be readily inferred.

Regarding the bad faith use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that there is no relationship with the Respondent and that the Respondent has not been authorized to sell any of the Complainant's products. However, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves prominently

displays the trade mark SYNGENTA and the logo used by the Complainant in an attempt to create a nonexistent connection to the Complainant. This clearly does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods and services. Bad faith use also follows from the fact that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trade mark SYNGENTA as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered on it. Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that in and of itself is potentially damaging to the reputation of the Complainant because the trade mark SYNGENTA and product images could be associated with its poor and suspicious construction. The website contains numerous inconsistencies, including references to a “summer sale”, a refund policy referring to body piercings, and a privacy policy naming an unrelated entity. There was no address for the company to be found on the website, and an email sent to “support” was unanswered. All this contributes to the impression that the website is being used for dubious activities. Finally, a clear indication of bad faith is the fact that no response was received to a cease-and-desist notification sent by the Complainant to the email address mentioned on the Respondent’s website.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of trade marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trade mark. It contains the word “syngenta” and the only difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trade mark is that the disputed domain name has the additional term “insecticide”. This difference does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Therefore, the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is met.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

First, the Respondent did not show that it owns any rights to the name "syngentainsecticide" nor that it has any license from the Complainant to use its trade mark SYNGENTA. Second, the Respondent did not argue that it is commonly known, or that it has ever been known under the name "syngentainsecticide".

Furthermore, the Panel did not find any evidence that the Respondent has used, or prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves shows the trade mark and logo of the Complainant as well as products of the Complainant in combination with elements that have nothing to do with the Complainant including references to a "summer sale", a refund policy referring to body piercings, and a privacy policy naming an unrelated entity. Such activities can never be a bona fide offering of goods or services and do not create any rights or legitimate interests 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.

With respect to the registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent clearly had the trade mark of the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name. This is obvious because the website to which the disputed domain name resolves shows the trade mark and logo of the Complainant. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is used in bad faith. This follows from the fact that the Respondent never received any authorization to use the trade mark SYNGENTA. By using the disputed domain name, the Respondent intentionally attracts Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trade mark SYNGENTA as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered on it. The Panel finally finds that the bad faith intentions of the Respondent follow from the numerous inconsistencies on the website of the Respondent, which include references to a "summer sale", a refund policy referring to body piercings, and a privacy policy naming an unrelated entity. Also, there was no address for the company to be found on the website, and an email sent to "support" was unanswered.

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 <syngentainsecticide.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Charles Gielen/

Charles Gielen

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026