

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Galgotias University, Smt. Shakuntla Educational and Welfare Society v.
Nanci Nette, Name Management Group
Case No. D2026-2672

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Galgotias University and Smt. Shakuntla Educational and Welfare Society, India, represented by Scriboard Advocates & Legal Consultants, India. (References to “the Complainant” below include both Complainants.)

The Respondent is Nanci Nette, Name Management Group, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <galgotias.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 June 19, 2026. On June 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 19, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 23, 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 June 25, 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 June 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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.

On August 19, 2026, the Panel issued a Procedural Order No. 1 ("PO1") inviting comments from the parties in connection with the date of the Respondent's acquisition of the disputed domain name. The Complainant filed a submission in response on August 22, 2026. The Respondent did not respond. The Decision due date was extended to September 1, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant owns and operates Galgotias University in Uttar Pradesh, India, which was established in 2011. The University currently caters for over 15,000 students, including a large body of international students from more than 28 countries.

The Complainant owns a number of registered trade marks for GALGOTIAS including Indian trade mark No. 1815302, registered on February 24, 2011.

The Complainant operates a website at "www.galgotiasuniversity.edu.in".

The Respondent acquired the disputed domain name on or around April 10, 2014¹.

As of January 9, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a pay-per-click ("PPC") website with education-related sponsored links.

The Respondent has been found to have registered and used domain names in bad faith in many other cases under the Policy. See, e.g., *RTX Corporation v. Nanci Nette, Name Management Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0880](#).

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Multiple Complainants

The Panel is satisfied that (a) the Complainants, which are related entities, have a specific common grievance against the Respondent and the Respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the Complainants in similar fashion and (b) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to allow this proceeding to be filed by both Complainants. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.

¹ The Respondent has not responded to PO1, which produced evidence that the Respondent had acquired the disputed domain name on or around April 10, 2014, and invited the Respondent to provide supporting dated evidence if it contended otherwise.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark 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 recognised 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.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the disputed domain name has been used for a parking page with PPC links to education-related services. Use of a domain name to host PPC links that compete with or capitalise on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users does not represent a bona fide offering. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

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 Panel's view, by using the disputed domain name - which the Respondent acquired after establishment of the Complainant's university and which comprises the Complainant's trade mark - in

connection with a parking page with PPC links relating to the Complainant's industry, the Respondent has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for "automatically" generated PPC links on its website. The fact that such links are generated by a third party such as a registrar or auction platform (or their affiliate) and/or the fact that the respondent itself may not have directly profited, are relevant considerations but do not of themselves prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5.

Further, or alternatively, the Panel considers that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its mark in a corresponding domain name, and the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct (see section 4 above), in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

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 <galgotias.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: September 1, 2026