

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Zoho Corporation Private Limited v. Melody Muir
Case No. D2026-0748

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Zoho Corporation Private Limited, India, represented by Abion GmbH, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Melody Muir, United States of America (the "United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <zohoscan.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 23, 2026. On February 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 24, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 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 amended Complaint on February 25, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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 technology company based in India, founded in 1996 as AdventNet, Inc. In 2004, it launched its first software under the Zoho brand, “Zoho Virtual Office.” In 2009, AdventNet, Inc. was renamed Zoho Corporation Private Limited. The Complainant is a technology company with over 130 million users around the world that provides global cloud-based software products and solutions. Its products include private cloud systems, sales, marketing, finance, human resources, legal, security and IT management, business intelligence and analytics, project management, and developer platforms. After more than 29 years, the Complainant has brought more than 55 products to the market and has more than 18,000 employees working in more than 30 offices across 24 different jurisdictions, including Germany, India, the Netherlands, Singapore, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The Complainant also provides document scanning and digitization services commonly referred to as “Zoho Scanner”, which form an integral part of the Complainant’s cloud-based software ecosystem. These services enable the automated and secure capture, processing, and management of physical documents across the Complainant’s various applications, platforms, and supported third-party services.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations for ZOHO in different jurisdictions, including the United States. These include, inter alia:

- International Registration ZOHO (word) Reg. No. 929558, registered on June 19, 2007;
- International Registration ZOHO (figurative) Reg. No. 1841998, registered on October 16, 2024;
- European Union Trademark ZOHO (word) Reg. No. 018721836, registered on November 2, 2022; and
- United States Trademark ZOHO (word) Reg. No. 3260807, registered on July 10, 2007.

The Complainant owns and operates numerous domain names incorporating its ZOHO trademark, including the domain name <zoho.com>, which was registered in 2004 and resolves to its official website, as well as the domain name <zohoscanner.com>, which was registered in 2020 and redirects to the Complainant’s official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 4, 2024. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page on the Hostinger DNS system. At the time of the decision, no content was available at the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is Melody Muir, a private person apparently located in the United States, as indicated by the information disclosed by the Registrar.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a cancellation of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it is the owner of multiple trademark registrations for ZOHO in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, the majority of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s ZOHO trademark in its entirety, followed by the descriptive term “scan”. The ZOHO trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the addition of a descriptive term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic

Top-Level Domain “.com” may be disregarded in the assessment. The disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's ZOHO trademark.

Concerning the second element, the Complainant contends that it has never had any relationship with the Respondent, nor has it ever granted the Respondent any rights to use the ZOHO trademark, including in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademarks; a search of the WIPO Global Brand Database revealed no trademark registrations corresponding to the terms “zohoscan” or “zoho scan”, and no results were returned when searching for trademarks possibly owned by the Respondent “Melody Muir”. Furthermore, a Google search for the terms “zohoscan” or “zoho scan” yields results referring exclusively to the Complainant and its products and services. The Complainant emphasizes that it provides document scanning and digitization services commonly referred to as “Zoho Scanner”, which form an integral part of its cloud-based software ecosystem, and that it owns the domain name <zohoscanner.com>, registered in 2020, which redirects to its official website. The composition of the disputed domain name reflects the Respondent's intention to create an association with the Complainant's well-known trademark and services, which cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page and is being passively held. The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, and is concealing its identity behind a privacy shield.

Concerning the third element, the Complainant contends that the majority of its trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to register it. The disputed domain name incorporates the ZOHO trademark in its entirety, followed by the term “scan”, which refers to one of the Complainant's core activities, namely providing document scanning and digitization services commonly referred to as “Zoho Scanner”. A simple online search for the terms “zohoscan” or “zoho scan” would have inevitably revealed the Complainant, its trademark, and its business. Given the well-known status of the ZOHO trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant's trademark or without the intent to target it. The disputed domain name is being passively held and resolves to a parking page; there is no evidence of any actual or contemplated good-faith use. Under the doctrine of passive holding, the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The Complainant further notes that the Respondent did not reply to its cease-and-desist letter, which infers bad faith, and that the Respondent is concealing its identity behind a privacy service in the publicly available WhoIs records, which constitutes further evidence of bad faith. On the balance of probabilities, there is no plausible good-faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- i. the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- ii. the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- iii. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this dispute on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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, "scan" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's ZOHO trademark.

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 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.

The Respondent's name does not correspond to the disputed domain name and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by it. Internet searches for the term "Zoho Scan" have yielded results largely related to the Complainant. No goods or services have been offered via 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.

In this case, the Panel has noted that the Respondent more likely than not has registered the disputed domain name in order to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Zoho trademark in its entirety, followed by the term "scan", which refers to one of the Complainant's core activities: providing document scanning and digitization services under "Zoho Scanner". The Panel concludes on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with prior knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and with the intent to target it.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and, in the absence of a response, finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Respondent did not reply to the cease-and-desist letter, which further supports a finding of 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 <zohoscan.com> be cancelled.

/Áron László/

Áron László

Sole Panelist

Date: April 7, 2026