

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MHG IP HOLDING (SINGAPORE) PTE. LTD. v. Vinay Machha, tbc
Case No. D2026-3127

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MHG IP HOLDING (SINGAPORE) PTE. LTD., Singapore, represented by Kochhar & Co., India.

The Respondent is Vinay Machha, tbc, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vakratunda-anantaraa.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 July 16, 2026. On July 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 16, 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 July 17, 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 July 18, 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 July 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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 company incorporated in Singapore and part of the Minor International PCL group. The Complainant, through its group companies, operates and manages hotels, resorts, serviced suites, restaurants, and spas internationally. The Complainant operates and manages hotels, resorts and spas under the ANANTARA brand, which it claims to have used since the year 2000. Its group has more than 50 ANANTARA luxury hotels, resorts and premium serviced apartments and more than 30 ANANTARA spas across Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Europe, including India. The evidence also shows an established Indian presence, including the Anantara Jewel Bagh Jaipur.

The Complainant owns an international trademark portfolio for the ANANTARA trademark, including but not limited to the following: Indian Trademark Registration No 5175784 for ANANTARA, registered on October 16, 2021 and Indian Trademark Registration No 5175783 for ANANTARA, registered on October 16, 2021. Registration No. 5175784 covers, inter alia, hotel and temporary accommodation services in Class 43, while Registration No. 5175783 covers, inter alia, real estate agency and management services in Class 36. The Panel also notes that previous panels applying the Policy have also found the ANANTARA trademark to be distinctive and well-known in the hospitality field, including in *MHG IP Holding (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. v. Anantara Resort and Spa*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4111](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on April 4, 2026. The evidence provided by the Complainant shows the disputed domain name resolving to a commercial website headed “Vakratunda Anantaraa Kolshet Road Thane West”. The website promotes 1 and 2 BHK apartments and a business park, provides prices and enquiry facilities, and identifies ISPL Machine Builders and the Vakratunda Group in connection with the development. It describes the development as being in Thane West, Mumbai, India and under construction and as offering “a promising opportunity for both homebuyers and investors looking for long-term value appreciation in a rapidly developing neighborhood”. The Panel notes that on the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name still directs to this 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ANANTARA trademark because it incorporates the expression “ANANTARAA” which the Complainant submits is phonetically identical and visually and conceptually confusingly similar to ANANTARA, with the mere addition of an extra letter “a” at the end. The Complainant further contends that the likelihood of confusion is heightened by the use of the disputed domain name in connection with the “VAKRATUNDA ANANTARAA” commercial real estate project, particularly given its asserted rights and activities in relation to Class 36 services and branded residences and residential developments.

As to rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant contends that it has never authorized, licensed, permitted, or otherwise consented to the Respondent’s use of the ANANTARA trademarks or to the registration of a domain name incorporating those trademarks or a confusingly similar variation. It further contends that there is no commercial, corporate, contractual, or other relationship between the Parties that could give rise to any right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that

the Respondent is not commonly known by “ANANTARA” or “ANANTARAA” and has not acquired trademark or other proprietary rights in those expressions. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, but is using the disputed domain name as part of a commercial real estate project promoted under the designation “VAKRATUNDA ANANTARAA”, and that the adoption of “ANANTARAA” is intended to create an association with the Complainant and its business. The Complainant also submits that the disputed domain name is used for commercial purposes and therefore does not constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

As to registration and use in bad faith, the Complainant contends that its ANANTARA trademarks had acquired substantial goodwill, reputation, and international recognition long before the registration of the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent’s adoption of “ANANTARAA” cannot reasonably be regarded as coincidental. It contends that the disputed domain name forms an integral part of the promotion and commercialization of the “VAKRATUNDA ANANTARAA” real estate project and was selected to create an association with, and derive benefit from, the goodwill and reputation associated with the ANANTARA trademarks. The Complainant further contends that, given the longstanding international use of ANANTARA and its numerous trademark registrations, the Respondent was aware, or ought reasonably to have been aware, of the Complainant’s rights when registering the disputed domain name. It submits that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is likely to create a false impression that the Respondent, its project, and its website are authorized by, affiliated with, endorsed by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant, and therefore constitutes an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant additionally contends that the Respondent continued to use and promote the “VAKRATUNDA ANANTARAA” designation after being placed on notice of the Complainant’s rights and objections.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, “vakratunda-” and the letter “a” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the ANANTARA trademark. There is also no evidence of any affiliation or other relationship between the Parties and there is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or holds trademark rights corresponding to it. Instead, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name has been used for a commercial website promoting a purported real estate development under the designation “Vakratunda Anantaraa”. Accordingly, the use of the disputed domain name is plainly commercial in nature and cannot constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Further, the website purportedly offers apartments and commercial premises, quotes prices, and invites prospective customers to make enquiries. In these circumstances, and in the absence of any explanation from the Respondent for its adoption of “Anantaraa”, which differs from the Complainant’s well-known ANANTARA trademark only by the addition of the letter “a”, or for any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant, the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case that it has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant’s well-known ANANTARA trademark in a readily recognizable form and combining it with the term “vakratunda”, together with its use in connection with the purported “Vakratunda Anantaraa” real estate development, creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. In the circumstances of the case, the disputed domain name may convey to Internet users an impression of a commercial association, sponsorship, or endorsement by the Complainant. Such circumstances do not support a finding of legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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 registered a domain name which incorporates the Complainant’s ANANTARA trademark in its entirety together with the term “VAKRATUNDA”. The Panel further notes that previous WIPO UDRP panels have recognized the ANANTARA trademark as distinctive and well-known in the hospitality field, including in *MHG IP Holding (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. v. Anantara Resort and Spa*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4111](#) and that the Complainant’s trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name on April 4, 2026 by several years. In the Panel’s view, even a cursory Internet or trademark search at the time of registration of the disputed domain name would have revealed the Complainant’s longstanding rights in the ANANTARA trademarks and their intensive use, including in India where the Respondent is purportedly located. In the circumstances of this case, the Panel

finds that the Respondent was, or should reasonably have been, aware of the Complainant and its prior trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name, which supports a finding of bad faith registration.

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.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is used in connection with a website promoting a commercial real estate development under the designation "Vakratunda Anantaraa". Such use amounts to an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ANANTARA trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and the real estate services promoted thereon, which constitutes evidence of bad faith use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, 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 <vakratunda-anantaraa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2026