

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nexus Automotive International SA v. nexus autoparts, Karthik Sambasivan,
Nexus Auto Parts
Case No. D2026-0386

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nexus Automotive International SA, Switzerland, represented by Abion GmbH, Switzerland.

The Respondents are nexus autoparts, India, and Karthik Sambasivan, Nexus Auto Parts, United States of America (“United States”) (collectively, “the Respondent”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <nexusautopartsusa.com> and <nexusautopartsus.com> are registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 29, 2026, initially only in regard to the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com>. On January 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com>. On January 30, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com> which differed from the named Respondent (“Redacted for Privacy”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 2, 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 February 6, 2026, also requesting the addition of the domain name <nexusautopartsusa.com> to the proceedings. On February 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the added domain name. On the same date, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 9, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different

underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed a second amended Complaint on February 12, 2026.

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 February 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was originally March 9, 2026.

On February 7, 10, 13, and 18, 2026, and March 5, and 7, 2026, the Center received email communications from the Respondents.

On February 25, 2026, upon the Complainant’s request, the proceedings were suspended for purposes of settlement discussions concerning the disputed domain names. On March 16, 2026, the proceedings were reinstated per the Complainant’s request. The new Response due date was March 29, 2026. On March 30, 2026, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on April 7, 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 automotive aftermarket business that operates under the mark NEXUS and other NEXUS-formative marks, with approximate turnover of some EUR 40 billion.

The Complainant owns a number of registered trade marks for NEXUSAUTO including International Registration No. 1327030, registered on October 13, 2016, in classes 12 and 37

The Complainant operates a website at “www.nexusautomotiveinternational.eu”.

The disputed domain names <nexusautopartsus.com> was registered on December 4, 2025.

On December 8, 2025, the company Nexus Auto Parts LLC was incorporated in Alabama, United States.

As of December 30, 2025, the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com> resolved to an “under construction” page.

The disputed domain name <nexusautopartsusa.com> was registered on January 25, 2026.

As of January 27, 2026, the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com> resolved to a website branded with a “NEXUS AUTO PARTS” logo and purporting offer used auto parts for sale. Amongst other things, the website stated: “At Nexus Auto, we offer high quality used parts sourced from some of the most trusted and best-selling automotive brands in the industry.”

As of January 29, 2026, the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com> resolved to an error page.

As of February 10, 2026, the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsusa.com> resolved to a website with similar content to the former auto parts website at <nexusautopartsus.com>.

As a February 11, 2026, there was a Google Maps listing for “Nexus Auto Parts” at a location in Alabama, with two photographs, both of which were uploaded in February 2026. The listing linked to the website at “www.nexusautopartsusa.com”.

The Complainant sent cease and desist letters on December 30, 2025, and January 9 and 15, 2026, to an email address that the Complainant considered to be associated with the Respondent. Based on the available record, no reply to said cease and desist letters was ever received.

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 names.

B. Respondent

The Center received multiple email communications from the different email addresses provided by the Registrar for the nominally different domain name registrants. As discussed in detail below, the Panel has decided to consolidate the dispute against the nominally different domain name registrants. However, for clarity, the Panel finds it is appropriate to address their contentions separately.

In email communications received on February 7, 18, 2026, and March 7, 2026, the registrant of the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com> contends that:

- it is the registrant of the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com>;
- the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com> is composed entirely of common, descriptive terms that are widely used within the automotive industry;
- he disputed domain name was registered in good faith based on its descriptive and brandable character for a contemplated automotive parts business and not to target or take advantage of any specific company or trade mark holder; and
- it does not agree that a transfer is appropriate given the commercial value of the disputed domain name, but the Respondent remains open to resolving this matter amicably.

In email communications received on February 10 and 13, 2026, the registrant of the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsusa.com>, aside from seemingly objecting to the consolidation of the dispute, contends as follows:

- it is the sole owner of Nexus Auto Parts LLC;
- it contracted a developer to register the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com> using contact details in India;
- to rectify this name to reflect that its business is focussed only in “the USA”, it registered the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsusa.com> and “dissociated” the prior domain name (<nexusautopartsus.com>), which it has asked its developer to “close”;
- it is not aware of, or associated with, the third party cited by the Complainant as related to the domain name <nexusautoparts.us>, not subject to the present dispute;
- it’s main focus is used auto parts;

- the Respondent in no way wants or intends to be associated with “Nexus Auto”; and
- in order to resolve the dispute, it updated all pages of its 's website to reflect “Nexus Auto Parts LLC” “as the company and establishment”.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation of Multiple Respondents and Respondent’s Identity

Although the Panel notes that, in its communication of February 10, 2026, the registrant of the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsusa.com> seemingly objected to the consolidation of the dispute, the Panel is nonetheless satisfied that consolidation is fair and equitable to all parties, and also procedurally efficient. The disputed domain names also seem to have been subject to common control, this being supported by the use of the disputed domain names to resolve to similar websites and by the assertion of the registrant of the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsusa.com> that it contracted a developer to build a website and register the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com>, but that it “dissociated the prior domain name” and that it contacted the “the developer to close the domain <https://nexusautopartsus.com>”.. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.11.2.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding and refers to both in this Decision as “the Respondent”.

The Panel further notes the Complainant’s claim in its Amended Complaint that the Respondent in this case is likely the same as the registrant of the domain name <nexusautoparts.us>, which is not subject to the present dispute and which the Complainant states is registered under the name of a third party. The Panel notes that such assertion is based on the similar composition, close temporal proximity and some similar registration data to the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes, however, that paragraph 1 of the Rules provides that the respondent is “the holder of a domain name registration against which a complaint is initiated”. The Registrar has disclosed the registrants of the disputed domain names to be “nexus autoparts” and “Karthik Sambasivan”. Therefore, the Panel determines that “nexus autoparts” and “Karthik Sambasivan” should remain as the named Respondent in this proceeding.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “parts”, “us”, and “usa”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 recognised 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and as further discussed below, the Panel considers that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract, confuse and profit from Internet users seeking the Complainant’s goods and/or services by impersonating the Complainant. Such use of the disputed domain names is not bona fide. Furthermore, when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com> was not being used for an active website let alone for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

As to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, while the Respondent’s corporate name, as well as its trading name shown in the Whois for the disputed domain names, reflect the disputed domain names, the circumstances of the case and the available record, indicate that the Respondent adopted its names specifically to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s rights, and, accordingly, such incorporation of a company, without further evidence of an independent legitimate business under its corporate name, cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests. See further under the third element below and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3. Accordingly, the Panel considers that paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy does not apply.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c) (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

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.

The Respondent contends that the disputed domain names were registered in good faith, based on their alleged descriptive and brandable character, for a contemplated automotive parts business, and that the Respondent neither wanted nor intended to be associated with “Nexus Auto”. The Respondent further claims that the disputed domain names are composed of “common, descriptive terms... which are widely used within the automotive industry”.

However, the Panel notes the following:

First, the Respondent has not denied that it was aware of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain names.

Second, the Respondent has failed to provide evidence supporting its assertion that “nexus” is in common or descriptive use in the automotive industry, whereas, on the face of it, this term is distinctive of the Complainant, a global and well-established automotive aftermarket business.

Third, the disputed domain names comprise the Complainant’s NEXUSAUTO mark plus “parts”, a term that is highly relevant to the Complainant’s goods/services and “us”, and “usa” denoting activity by the Complainant in the United States.

Fourth, the Respondent has used both of the disputed domain names for websites that may create the impression that they were associated with the Complainant, including by the Respondent: using a “NEXUS AUTO PARTS” logo; referring to itself as “Nexus Auto”; offering the same kind of products provided by the Complainant; and failing to include a prominent disclaimer.

For the above reasons, the Panel considers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its websites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trade mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Dealing with the Respondent’s arguments:

- That the Respondent’s developer registered the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com> using contact details in India, and that the Respondent subsequently “closed” that domain name and registered the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsusa.com> to reflect its alleged focus on “the USA”. The Panel is not clear exactly why the Respondent felt it necessary to make this switch but, in any case, the Panel does not consider that such matters are relevant. In the Panel’s view, there is no material difference between the disputed domain names; each of them comprises the Complainant’s distinctive mark plus a descriptor of its products, and each uses similar geographical indicators for the United States – the terms “us” and “usa”. Furthermore, both disputed domain names have been used for similar websites that may create the impression of an association with the Complainant, as discussed above.
- That the Respondent allegedly updated all pages of its website to reflect “Nexus Auto Parts LLC” “as the company and establishment”. The Panel has not seen any evidence of this on the available record. However, not only is reference to such an entity name likely to increase, rather than reduce, confusion, but the Panel notes that the Respondent’s entity was incorporated only a few days after registration of the disputed domain name <nexusautopartsus.com>, and that the Respondent has not put forward any explanation, let alone a credible one, as to why it selected a corporate name based on the term “Nexus”. Under these circumstances, it seems likely that that the Respondent’s adoption of such corporate name was, instead, pretextual and possibly part of an illegitimate scheme designed to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s rights.

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 names <nexusautopartsusa.com> and <nexusautopartsus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2026