

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Felisbela Campos
Case No. D2026-2689

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Felisbela Campos, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syngentagrupo.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Wild West Domains, 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 Domain Name. On June 22, 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 (DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 23, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 23, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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

According to the information provided in the Complaint, Complainant is a leading, science-based agriculture company. Headquartered in Switzerland, Complainant has more than 30,000 employees across over 90 countries and its products include agrochemicals for crop protection as well as vegetable and flower seeds.

Complainant or an affiliated company owns multiple trademarks for SYNGENTA including:

- International trademark SYNGENTA, registration number 732663, registration date March 8, 2000, and
- United States trademark SYNGENTA, registration number 3036058, registration date December 27, 2005.

In addition, Complainant operates multiple domain names incorporating its trademarks, including the domain names <syngenta.com> and <syngentagroup.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on June 15, 2026. The Domain Name resolves to a parking page. The Domain Name has been used for a fraudulent email scheme.

The trademark registrations of Complainant were issued prior to the registration of the Domain Name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has established rights. The Domain Name incorporates the SYNGENTA trademark in its entirety and contains the additional term "grupo", which is Portuguese and Spanish for the word "group". Group is a common business description and the use of the term, even in Portuguese, is an obvious and deliberate reference to the website of Complainant "www.syngentagroup.com".

According to Complainant, Respondent has no rights nor any legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant submits that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, nor is Respondent authorized to use Complainant's registered trademark. Complainant asserts that the Domain Name was used for fraudulent email activity.

According to Complainant, the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and employed as part of a deliberate fraud and phishing scheme. The Domain Name was used to send an email impersonating an actual Syngenta employee in an apparent attempt to fraudulently obtain invoice and payment related information from one of Complainant's distributors in Portugal. As the phishing scheme targeted Portuguese speaking recipients, Respondent's selection of the term "grupo" in the Domain Name further evidences his or her intent to mislead victims into believing any email correspondence would be credible. The timing of these events is also significant. The Domain Name was registered on June 15, 2026, and was deployed in furtherance of the phishing scheme that same day. These actions demonstrated that Respondent registered the Domain Name with fraudulent intent from the outset rather than for any legitimate purpose. References to "Syngenta" were present throughout the email. A link to the official website of Complainant in Portugal was also included in the email's signature block. These details leave no doubt that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant's

well-known SYNGENTA trademark at the time of registration. This impersonation of a Syngenta employee, the use of the SYNGENTA trademark, and the targeted outreach to one of Complainant's distributors shows clear intent to deceive and constitutes compelling evidence of bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the Domain Name should be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in this proceeding.

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.

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 SYNGENTA mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The Panel finds that the addition of the term "grupo" (Spanish and Portuguese for "group") in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use any of its trademarks or to register the Domain Name incorporating its trademark.

Based on the undisputed submission and evidence provided by Complainant, as summarized above, Respondent used the Domain Name to impersonate Complainant by sending an email to its distributor in Portugal asking for financial information. Sending an email using the email address “[...]@syngentagrupo.com”, impersonating a “Senior Accountant” of Complainant and asking for financial information is an obvious attempt to commit financial fraud. UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as, in the present case, impersonation and an attempt to commit financial fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel does not consider such use a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. The Panel adds that the current use of the Domain Name to host a parked page comprising PPC links also does not represent a bona fide offering of goods and services. Respondent is also not commonly known by the Domain Name nor has Respondent acquired any trademark or service mark rights.

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 Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Noting the overall circumstances of this case, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent knew or in any event should have known Complainant's SYNGENTA mark. The registration of the Domain Name in awareness of the trademarks and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

In particular, the Panel takes into account that previous panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as, in the present case, impersonation, phishing and sending a fraudulent email asking for financial information constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel also takes into account that Respondent used false and contradictory contact information during the registration of the Domain Name which provides additional evidence of bad faith. Respondent provided a street address in Alabama with Zip Code 10025. This address does not exist. A quick look up by the Panel in publicly available information noted that the 10025 Zip Code provided during registration is not in Alabama, but in New York City. The registrant information disclosed by the Registrar obviously contains deliberately false details. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1, notes that the use of false contact details can be considered as evidence of bad faith registration and use. Panels have consistently found that respondents who deliberately provide false contact information to avoid being contactable demonstrate bad faith conduct, particularly when combined with other evidence of illegitimate activity, such as impersonation and attempt at financial fraud.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name, <syngentagrupo.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan/

Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan

Sole Panelist

Date: August 3, 2026