

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Ngo Trung
Case No. D2026-2376

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ngo Trung, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syngenta-teambuilding2025.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 2, 2026. On June 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 2, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc., Customer 0174782680) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 5, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 June 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 10, 2026. On June 22, 2026, the proceedings were suspended upon the Complainant's request and on July 10, 2026, the Complainant requested to reinstitute the proceeding. The proceedings were reinstituted on July 14, 2026. Accordingly, the new due date for Response was July 22, 2026.

The Center notified the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment process on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 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 global agricultural technology company headquartered in Switzerland, with over 30,000 employees operating across more than 90 countries. It utilizes cutting-edge innovation to assist farmers in growing resilient, healthy crops while promoting sustainable farming practices. Its product portfolio includes agrochemicals for crop protection, as well as vegetable and flower seeds.

The Complainant operates under the brand SYNGENTA and is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide for this mark, including:

- International Trademark Registration No. 732663, SYNGENTA (word), registered on March 8, 2000, in classes 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41, and 42, with designations in various jurisdictions, including, among many others, Viet Nam; and

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

(Hereinafter collectively referred to as the "SYNGENTA Mark").

The Complainant also owns multiple domain names incorporating its trademark, including <syngenta.com>, which resolves to its primary official global website.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 29, 2025, and it resolves to a landing page that prominently displays the disputed domain name and features various Pay-Per-Click ("PPC") sections under headings incorporating the SYNGENTA Mark, such as "Syngenta Team Building 2025 Schedule," "Syngenta Team Building 2025 Dates," "Syngenta Team Building 2025 Calendar," and "Syngenta Team Building 2025 Registration," as well as other sections including "Team Building Activities" and "Team Building Meaning." Currently, active PPC links are generated only under the "Team Building Activities" section, redirecting users to third-party e-commerce platforms such as Amazon and Etsy. Additionally, the header of the website displays the message: "This domain has expired. If you own this domain, contact your registration provider for assistance. To identify your provider, click HERE," which redirects users to the website at "www.tucowsdomains.com." The Respondent's website contains no information regarding the identity of its registrant or operator, nor does it include any information clarifying the absence of any affiliation or endorsement by the Complainant. The website's copyright notice reads "Copyright © syngenta-teambuilding2025.com. All rights reserved," and includes a link titled "Privacy Policy" that redirects users to GoDaddy's privacy policy page.

On May 13, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via the contact email address listed in the Whois record for the disputed domain name. A follow-up reminder was subsequently sent to the same address. The Respondent did not reply to either communication.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SYNGENTA Mark. Specifically, the disputed domain name incorporates the SYNGENTA Mark in its entirety, accompanied only by the terms "teambuilding2025" separated by a hyphen. The Complainant asserts that the inclusion of these terms reinforces the confusing similarity because "team building" refers to corporate activities common in major enterprises; so these terms increase the false affiliation suggesting an official event or internal corporate initiative of the Complainant. Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard technical requirement and should be disregarded under the first element assessment.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, or otherwise authorized to use the SYNGENTA Mark. Moreover, the use of the disputed domain name to host a parked landing page featuring PPC links does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it represent a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith to capitalize on the reputation of the SYNGENTA Mark through a PPC page that generates click-through revenue. The PPC links on the Respondent's website are not generic; rather, they specifically refer to "Syngenta Team Building 2025," demonstrating the Respondent's clear knowledge of and intent to target the Complainant and its brand. Given the distinctiveness and global reputation of the SYNGENTA Mark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights. Hosting PPC links that capitalize on a well-known trademark to generate commercial gain constitutes bad faith use. By using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users for commercial gain through likelihood of confusion as to affiliation or sponsorship, the Respondent is engaging in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Moreover, the misleading nature of the domain name - implying an official corporate "team building" initiative - heightens the risk of deception, including potential phishing or fraudulent schemes targeting the Complainant's employees, partners, or customers. Lastly, the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist communications further corroborates its bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

However, on June 10, 2026, the Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center confirming receipt of the Notification of the Complaint. In that communication, the Respondent stated that it had never used the disputed domain name, had "no intention of retaining ownership or using it for any future purpose," and noted that the disputed domain name had already expired. On that basis, the Respondent indicated that it would not be submitting a formal Response and requested that the Center "proceed with the necessary next steps concerning this domain name."

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant has submitted all relevant assertions under the Policy, and the dispute properly falls within its scope. The Panel has the authority to decide the dispute by examining the three elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into account all relevant evidence, annexed materials, and submissions. The Panel may also conduct limited independent research pursuant to its general powers, as provided, inter alia, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

The Respondent's communication may be treated as an informal, unilateral consent to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.10.

However, the Panel considers it appropriate to issue a full decision on the merits.

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, namely the SYNGENTA Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the addition of the terms "teambuilding2025" separated by a hyphen. The Panel finds that the mark remains clearly 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 the terms here, "teambuilding2025" (or "team building 2025"), may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Consequently, 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 Panel observes that the SYNGENTA mark is a highly distinctive, coined term with no dictionary meaning, which shares no similarity with the Respondent's name. Furthermore, the Panel has searched the Global Brand Database, confirming that the Respondent holds no trademark registrations for the term "Syngenta" or for the phrases forming the disputed domain name ("Syngenta-teambuilding2025" or "Syngenta team building 2025").¹

The Panel further notes the Respondent's failure to submit a formal Response. In the Respondent's communication it acknowledged that it had never used the disputed domain name and had no intention of doing so in the future, demonstrating a complete absence of use (or demonstrable preparations for use) in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name - combining the distinctive SYNGENTA Mark with terms referencing a "team building" event in 2025 - carries a risk of implied affiliation, generating confusion as to sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. Corporate team-building initiatives are customary for major global enterprises like the Complainant, which operates in over 90 countries with more than 30,000 employees. Consequently, the disputed domain name is inherently misleading, making it virtually impossible to conceive any plausible, legitimate use by the Respondent.

In addition, the current use of the disputed domain name to host a parked webpage featuring PPC links does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services where such links capitalize on or compete with the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's mark - as is the case here due to the misleading nature of the domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent has stated that it had no intention of retaining ownership or using the disputed domain name for any future purpose and has provided a tacit informal consent to its transfer to the Complainant when it claimed: "I request that WIPO proceed with the necessary next steps concerning this domain name".

The Panel further notes the distinctiveness of the SYNGENTA Mark and its global reputation in the agriculture industry, as recognized by prior decisions under the Policy - a finding with which this Panel fully concurs. See, e.g., *Syngenta Participations AG v. Bui Dang Truong*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1540](#); *Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Scott McKinney*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2170](#); *Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. twanam withrow68*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2208](#); and *Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Hind Arton, Syngenta LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0901](#).

Given the distinctive nature of the SYNGENTA Mark, its global use, and its well-established international reputation - including in Viet Nam, where the Respondent is located according to the Registrar's verification - together with the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the terms "teambuilding2025" (separated by a hyphen), suggesting an internal corporate event organized by the Complainant. This evidences a deliberate composition to target the Complainant's well-known trademark and generate web traffic through likelihood of confusion and false implied affiliation. Such a composition strongly supports a finding of bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

¹ Under the general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, a panel may undertake limited factual research into public records if such information is useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

Regarding the use of the disputed domain name, it resolves to a parking page with PPC links that prominently display the Complainant's reputed trademark in its section titles, further corroborating the targeting of the Complainant. UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for content appearing on a website associated with its domain name, and that hosting PPC links that capitalize on a trademark constitutes evidence of bad faith use. Even if the PPC links were automatically generated by a third party or registrar parking service, UDRP consensus dictates that a domain name holder remains responsible for the content displayed on its website. A registrant cannot avoid bad-faith liability by outsourcing commercial monetization to automated algorithms, particularly where the domain name itself targets a famous trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5.

Under these circumstances, the Respondent has offered no plausible or supported explanation for registering the disputed domain name, nor has it rebutted the Complainant's allegations of bad faith, merely stating that the domain name was never used and had allegedly expired.

The Panel also attaches weight to the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter sent prior to the commencement of this proceeding. Such non-response to a formal assertion of rights further corroborates the Respondent's bad faith registration and use.

In conclusion, taking into account all of these factors, the Panel considers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to unfairly profit from the Complainant's trademark reputation by attracting Internet users to its website for commercial gain through a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. This constitutes bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Consequently, based on the totality of the record, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been satisfied.

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 <syngenta-teambuilding2025.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/

Reyes Campello Estebaranz

Sole Panelist

Date: August 10, 2026