

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cisco Technology, Inc. v. Ratapoom Thurntanom
Case No. D2026-1773

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cisco Technology, Inc., United States of America (or “US”), represented by Fenwick & West, LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Ratapoom Thurntanom, Thailand.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sfpcisco.com> (the “Domain Name”) 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 April 24, 2026. On April 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 28, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Customers of GDPR Masked) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 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 May 4, 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 May 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Given the absence of a Response, the Panel has carefully reviewed the record and confirm that the Respondent received the opportunity for fair notice of this proceeding. The Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen, David H. Bernstein, and Anita Gerewal as panelists in this matter on June 12, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 owns a portfolio of trademark and domain name registrations pertaining to its business and that of its licensees, including Cisco Systems, Inc., which is the primary public face of CISCO businesses throughout the world. The Cisco group provides products and services ranging from networking and communications equipment and software, including telephone communications systems, routers, video conferencing systems, and collaboration products and services, to financing services, retail store services, training and certification programs and blogs. Cisco Systems, Inc., is traded on NASDAQ with more than 75,000 employees in countries throughout the world. Cisco has used its CISCO trademark to market and sell its products since 1984.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations for CISCO in different jurisdictions, such as US trademark registration no. 1542339 (registered June 6, 1989) and Thailand trademark registration no. 351064 (registered on July 9, 2012).

The Complainant has also registered various domain names incorporating its CISCO trademark, for example <cisco.com> and <cisco.co.uk>.

The Domain Name was registered on August 22, 2010. The Complainant has documented that the Domain Name resolves to a website that appears to sell, inter alia, Cisco's products as well as products compatible with brands of the Complainant's competitors.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant documents registered trademark rights in CISCO and argues that its trademark is internationally famous and found to be "well-known" in prior WIPO UDRP decisions. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark. The inclusion of the term "sfp" as a prefix is not sufficient to distinguish the Domain Name from the Complainant's trademark. "sfp" is a recognized acronym in the networking industry for "small form-factor pluggable" transceiver modules.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Given the Complainant's established rights in the CISCO trademark, the Respondent cannot have rights or legitimate interests to the Domain Name. The Respondent has not been commonly known by the Domain Name at the time of registration. The Respondent is not using the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Domain Name. The Complainant asserts that the Domain Name redirects to a website that is designed to mislead users to believe that the site is operated by an authorized seller of Cisco's products. The Respondent does not accurately and prominently disclose its lack of any relationship with the Complainant. Moreover, the Respondent is not using the site to sell only Cisco's trademarked goods; rather, it also sells other brands of transceivers on its website that compete with Cisco products.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. Moreover, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent registered and uses the Domain Name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, and/or affiliation with the Respondent's website and the goods offered on the Respondent's website. The Complainant argues

that the Respondent is trading off the Complainant's reputation and goodwill and misleading consumers by making unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademarks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established trademark rights in CISCO because it owns a valid trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including in the United States and in Thailand (where the Respondent is based). The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark, with the addition "sfp". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the Top-Level Domains. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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. While 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 often-impossible task of "proving a negative" by 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or names corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent does not meet the conditions for an unauthorized reseller to be making a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8. The Respondent's website sells other brands of transceivers that compete with the Complainant's products which

means that the use of the CISCO mark in the Domain Name is essentially a bait and switch. In addition, the website does not make it clear that the Respondent is not an official or authorized Cisco reseller.

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 Domain Name. As such, the Complainant has sustained its burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Based on the available record, 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 composition and use of the Domain Name prove that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered it. The use of the Domain Name for unauthorized sale of the Complainant's products, without disclosing the Respondent's lack of relationship with the trademark, coupled with a website that operates as a bait and switch by attracting consumers with the CISCO trademark but then switches many of those consumers to buy competitive replacement transceivers, is clear evidence of bad faith use under the Policy. Taken together, this conduct by the Respondent constitutes an effort to intentionally attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source or affiliation, paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The third element 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 the Domain Name <sfpcisco.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/
Mathias Lilleengen
Presiding Panelist

/David H. Bernstein/
David H. Bernstein
Panelist

/Anita Gerewal/
Anita Gerewal
Panelist
Date: June 26, 2026