

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Zydus Wellness Products Limited v. Ramkumar A,
ReadylinkCommunication and Services
Case No. D2026-1576

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Zydus Wellness Products Limited, India, represented by Rahul Chaudhry & Partners, India.

The Respondent is Ramkumar A, ReadylinkCommunication and Services, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nycil.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 April 14, 2026. On April 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 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 (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC / DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 16, 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 16, 2026, and April 20, 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 April 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 18, 2026. The Respondent sent an email

communication to the Center on May 20, 2026, stating that it had registered the disputed domain name on behalf of a third party and that it did not recall receiving prior communications relating to this proceeding.

The relevant communications were thereafter forwarded to the Respondent's RVR-confirmed email address, together with the third-party email address copied by the Respondent in its May 20, 2026, communication.

The Center notes that the Response due date expired on May 11, 2026, and that the Panel Appointment process had already commenced at the time the Respondent contacted the Center.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder as the sole panelist in this matter on May 27, 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 an Indian company engaged in the manufacturing and marketing of consumer products. One of the Complainant's brands is NYCIL. The Complainant's NYCIL mark is a coined and invented mark, with no dictionary meaning.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for the NYCIL mark in India. The details of a few such registrations are as below:

- NYCIL (word mark) – Indian Trademark Registration No. 147987 in class 5 registered on March 15, 1951;
- NYCIL (device mark) – Indian Trademark Registration No. 774599 in class 5 registered on September 17, 1997; and
- NYCIL (figurative mark) – Indian Trademark Registration No. 1426342 in class 5 registered on March 3, 2006.

The Complainant operates its official website at "www.zyoduswellness.com" and maintains a dedicated webpage for products under the NYCIL mark.

The disputed domain name <nycil.com> was registered on February 11, 2006. The disputed domain name is parked and does not resolve to an active website.

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.

The Complainant contends that it is the owner of the trademark NYCIL and that the mark has been used extensively and continuously for several decades. The Complainant contends that the mark NYCIL was adopted in the year 1951. The Complainant states that NYCIL is a coined and invented trademark and has acquired substantial goodwill and reputation in India. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademark NYCIL.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that the Respondent is neither a licensee nor otherwise authorized to use the NYCIL mark. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the term "NYCIL" and has no trademark rights in the same.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is parked and does not resolve to an active website. According to the Complainant, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of the goodwill and reputation associated with the NYCIL mark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent intentionally registered a domain name identical to the Complainant's trademark and is using the same to create a likelihood of confusion among consumers.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, following the Notification of Respondent's Default, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on May 20, 2026, stating that it had registered the disputed domain name on behalf of a third party and that it did not recall receiving prior communications relating to the proceeding.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel notes that the Respondent did not submit any formal Response and provided no evidence in support of the statements made in its email communication, including its claim that it had registered the disputed domain name on behalf of a third party. The Panel further notes that the Respondent was copied on the case communications after the issue was brought to the Center's attention and was afforded an opportunity to participate in the proceeding. Furthermore, the third-party on whose behalf the disputed domain name was allegedly registered, was copied on the relevant case communication yet chose not to comment on or otherwise participate in these proceedings. In the circumstances, the Panel has taken note of the Respondent's communication but finds no basis to delay the proceeding or request further submissions.

The Panel further notes that, pursuant to paragraph 2(a) of the Rules, the Center's obligation is to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent; actual notice itself is not required. The record shows that the Center sent the Written Notice and Complaint to the postal and email addresses disclosed by the Registrar and to the email address associated with the disputed domain name, in accordance with the procedures prescribed under paragraph 2(a) of the Rules. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Center discharged its notification responsibilities and that the proceeding may properly continue to a decision on the available record.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 does not appear to hold any trademark rights in the term NYCIL. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the NYCIL mark. There is also no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s coined and distinctive trademark NYCIL. In the circumstances of this case, where the Respondent is unaffiliated with the Complainant and has provided no explanation for its registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel is unable to conceive of any plausible use of the disputed domain name that would confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark NYCIL and is parked and does not resolve to a website. The Panel finds that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of 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 the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant’s trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel further notes that NYCIL is a coined and invented mark with no dictionary meaning. In these circumstances, the Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is parked and does not resolve to an active website. Given the identity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark, Internet users are likely to expect that the disputed domain name is associated with or affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent has not provided any explanation for its registration or use of the disputed domain name.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name including a blank page would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [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 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. In reaching this conclusion, the Panel has had regard to the following: (i) the Complainant's NYCIL mark has been used for several decades and enjoys a strong reputation in India; (ii) the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions; (iii) the disputed domain name is parked and does not resolve to an active website; and (iv) it is not possible to conceive of any plausible legitimate use of the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's coined and invented NYCIL mark.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <nycil.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Shwetasree Majumder/

Shwetasree Majumder

Sole Panelist

Date: June 10, 2026