

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Hind Arton, Syngenta LLC
Case No. D2026-0901

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Hind Arton, Syngenta LLC, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syngennta.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 2, 2026. On March 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 4, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 March 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova 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 Swiss global agriculture technology company operating under the name “Syngenta”.

The Complainant specializes in science-based agricultural innovation, develops and markets a wide range of crop protection products as well as vegetable and flower seeds. The Complainant has more than 30,000 employees across over 90 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations incorporating the mark SYNGENTA, including, inter alia:

- International Trademark Registration SYNGENTA (word), No. 732663, registered on March 8, 2000 in classes 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41, and 42; and
- United States trademark registration SYNGENTA (word), No. 3036058, registered on December 27, 2005 in classes 1, 5, 16, 31, 35, 36, 41, and 42.

The Complainant operates the official domain name <syngenta.com> since September 8, 1999.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 30, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page with pay-per-click links.

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:

(1) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, since it incorporates the SYNGENTA mark with only a minor misspelling, and the insertion of an additional letter “n” does not prevent confusion. The difference of one character does not change the overall impression of the domain name, which remains visually and phonetically similar to the Complainant's mark.

(2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with pay-per-click links, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services.

(3) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered on January 30, 2026. The Respondent used the disputed domain name primarily for commercial gain by operating a parking page with pay-per-click links. By using the Complainant's trademark and adding an additional letter “n”, the Respondent created a typo-squatting domain name, which further supports a finding of bad faith under the Policy. The failure to reply to the Complainant's cease and desist notice sent to the Respondent's email address may be considered an element of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer the disputed domain name. In UDRP cases, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, the Complainant has to demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

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

The Respondent was given proper notice of the Complaint and had the opportunity to respond. Under paragraph 5(a) of the Rules, the Respondent was required to submit its response within 20 days of commencement of the proceeding. The Respondent failed to do so.

Pursuant to paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the event of such a default, the Panel shall proceed to a decision based on the Complaint. However, the Respondent's default does not mean that the Complainant automatically prevails; the Complainant continues to bear the burden of proof on each element. The Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's silence, and, where appropriate, accept as true the reasonable allegations in the Complaint that are not contradicted by evidence.

The Panel has reviewed the entire case file and the evidence provided. The Panel is also guided, where pertinent, by the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), which reflects consensus positions of UDRP panels on many common issues. The Panel will make reference to these consensus views in the analysis below as applicable.

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.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its SYNGENTA mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's SYNGENTA mark in its entirety, with the only difference being the addition of the letter "n". In accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9, a domain name consisting of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark under the first element, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is required only for technical reasons and is generally disregarded for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's mark to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 3.1](#), 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 evidence before the Panel shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising pay-per-click links. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page with pay-per-click links. The use of the disputed domain name - which contains an inherently misleading misspelling of the Complainant's mark - for a parking page with pay-per-click links to mislead Internet users seemingly for financial gain cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9. See also *Sandoz AG v. shi lei*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2965](#).

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has established trademark rights in SYNGENTA and has confirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademark. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. In this regard, the Panel notes that the registrant organization identified in the registration details of the disputed domain name is "Syngenta LLC", however, there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is actually commonly known by "Syngenta LLC". Rather, it appears most likely that such details were specifically chosen to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant.

In light of the Respondent's failure to participate in the proceedings, the absence of any credible evidence of rights or legitimate interests, and the clear intent to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant is well known for being one of the leading global agriculture technology companies operating since 1999 under the “Syngenta” name. The Complainant offers a wide range of crop protection products as well as vegetable and flower seeds and provides farmers worldwide with advanced solutions to meet the challenges of modern agriculture.

Given the distinctive nature of the SYNGENTA mark and the Complainant’s well-established international reputation, including in the United States where the Respondent resides, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s rights. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the letter “n”, a classic form of typosquatting that evidences deliberate targeting. Such a domain name composition strongly supports a finding of bad-faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with pay-per-click links. Panels have held that a respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for content appearing on the website associated with its domain name and such use may constitute evidence of bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5.

In these circumstances where the Respondent has offered no plausible or supported explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent was most likely aware of the Complainant at the time of registration. The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent’s website or location. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Respondent has not provided any explanation for selecting the disputed domain name, and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its mark. The absence of any Response further reinforces the inference of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

Considering the totality of circumstances, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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 <syngennta.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/
Ganna Prokhorova
Sole Panelist
Date: April 14, 2026