ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Google LLC v. pratheesh payyanayil
Case No. D2026-1324

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Google LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fidus Law Chambers, India.

The Respondent is pratheesh payyanayil, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <googlepixelservicekerala.com> 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 March 27, 2026. On March 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 27, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 1, 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 April 6, 2026, and a second amended Complaint on April 15, 2026, in reply to the Center's additional request for amendment.

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 April 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on May 26, 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, established in 1998, is the operator of one of the most highly recognized and widely used Internet search engines in the world, under the GOOGLE trademark. The Complainant is also responsible for the development of a range of consumer electronic devices under its PIXEL- branded line of hardware devices.

The search engine service under the GOOGLE trademark is available in more than 150 languages and is globally accessible, including in India.

The Complainant's GOOGLE trademark has been found to be one of the most valuable global brands by several brand analytics and valuation consultancies.

The GOOGLE trademark has been declared well-known and/or a famous trademark in several jurisdictions including Brazil, China, Denmark, Mexico, Ukraine, Thailand, Türkiye, and India, to list a few. The GOOGLE trademark is also included in the well-known trademarks list maintained by the Indian Trade Marks Registry.

The Complainant owns various registrations for the GOOGLE trademark on a standalone basis and also as part of other trademarks, including GOOGLE PIXEL, worldwide, including in India, in several classes. Its earliest registration dates from September 16, 1998, in the United States, and from 1999 in India.

The Complainant is the owner, inter alia, of the following trademarks:

Indian trademark registration No. 1480385 for GOOGLE (word mark), registered on August 21, 2006.

Indian trademark registration No. 3755867 for GOOGLE PIXEL (word mark), registered on February 16, 2018.

Indian trademark registration No. 3379662 for G PIXEL (device), filed on October 3, 2016.

United States trademark registration No. 2884502 for GOOGLE (word mark), registered on September 14, 2004.

The Complainant also owns and operates over 190 "Google" based domain names and corresponding websites where search products and services are accessible.

The Complainant has successfully pursued domain name complaints before different providers and has obtained favorable decisions in respect of numerous domain names targeting the Complainant's trademarks, such as <googlepixel.com>, <googlepixel.co.in>, <googlerepairkerala.com>, <googlemontenegro.me>, <googlemontenegro.me>, <google-sina.com>, <googlevietnam.com>, <iran-google.ir>, <iran-googel.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 10, 2020.

At the time of this Decision the disputed domain name resolves to a website where repair services for Google Pixel devices are offered.

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 addition of the generic term "service" and the geographic term "kerala" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademarks and activities, and that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name, paragraphs 4(a)(i)-(iii) of the Policy require that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

(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.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("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 entirety of the Complainant's trademarks is reproduced and recognizable 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, "service" and "kerala", 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 name and the Complainant's GOOGLE, PIXEL, and GOOGLE PIXEL trademarks 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 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.

According to the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, nor any element from which the Panel could infer a Respondent's right in the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website promoting repair services for the Complainant's "Google Pixel" smartphones, without providing any disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant. The Panel finds that such use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name, by reproducing the Complainant's trademarks without providing a clearly visible and prominent statement disclaiming any association with the Complainant, suggests that it is connected to an official site of the Complainant or of one of its affiliated entities. In addition, the disputed domain name, by incorporating the Complainant's registered and well-known trademark in combination with the term "services" and a geographical term, and without the addition of any qualifying terms that may indicate non-affiliation, is inherently misleading.

Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the present case, owing to the distinctiveness and worldwide renown of the Complainant's trademarks, the composition of the disputed domain name, entirely reproducing the Complainant's trademarks, and the Respondent's use of the Complainant's trademarks on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, the Panel finds that it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, and so the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name having the Complainant and its trademarks in mind.

Past panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the trademark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful trademarks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.) In this case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the renowned GOOGLE and GOOGLE PIXEL trademarks, and was registered by the Respondent, who has no relationship with the Complainant, thereby giving rise to a presumption of bad faith.

The Panel further finds that, in view of the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website promoting repair services of the Complainant's products without providing any disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website and the services promoted therein according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Finally, the Panel notes that the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's assertions made in these proceedings further supports a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

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 <googlepixelservicekerala.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/
Fabrizio Bedarida
Sole Panelist
Date: June 9, 2026