

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bennett, Coleman and Company Limited, and Times Internet Limited v.
Gurpreet Singh Arora
Case No. DAI2025-0033

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Bennett, Coleman and Company Limited (the “Complainant No. 1”), and Times Internet Limited, (the “Complainant No. 2”) India, (collectively referred to as “the Complainants”) represented by Intl Advocare, India.

The Respondent is Gurpreet Singh Arora, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <economictimes.ai> 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 18, 2025. On July 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 21, 2025, 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 (Anonymous / Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 24, 2025, 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 July 24, 2025.

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 July 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Meera Chature Sankhari as the sole panelist in this matter on August 22, 2025. 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 No. 1 is popularly known as “The Times Group”, which is engaged in the business of publishing newspapers, journals, magazines, and books. The Complainant No. 1 has published one of its flagship newspapers, “The Economic Times” in 1961. The publication provides extensive national and international coverage of politics, business, trade, and industry, etc. According to the Complainant, “The Economic Times”, is the most widely read financial daily in India and ranks as the second most read financial daily globally. As per the India Readership Survey (IRS) Q1-2019, “The Economic Times” recorded a total readership of 37 lakhs.

The Complainant No. 2, established in 1999, owns, operates, and invests in various Internet-led products, services, and technologies, and serves as the digital arm of Complainant No. 1. They operate mobile applications under both the THE ECONOMIC TIMES and ET marks, further extending the brand’s digital presence.

The Complainant No. 1 has secured multiple trademark registrations for its marks both in India and internationally. The Complainant No. 1 has registered the mark THE ECONOMIC TIMES (LABEL) (Registration No. 552520) on June 11, 1991, and the word mark THE ECONOMIC TIMES ONLINE (Registration No. 690418) on December 12, 1995, in India. Additionally, the device mark for THE ECONOMIC TIMES (Registration No. 40202509499Q) was registered in Singapore on April 17, 2025. The Complainants submit that the rights in the mark THE ECONOMIC TIMES have been consistently recognized by courts, tribunals, the Trade Marks Registry, and the INDRP (NIXI) adjudicatory panel. The mark has also been officially declared as a well-known trademark by the Indian Trade Marks Registry. Furthermore, the Complainant has registered the mark THE ECONOMIC TIMES and its formative marks with the Press Registrar General of India.

The Complainants have also submitted detailed statements regarding their annual revenue, promotional expenses, annual circulation figures, average page views, and significant social media presence, all of which reflect the brand’s immense reputation and substantial goodwill among the public. In addition, the Complainants regularly organize summits, conclaves, and award ceremonies, further enhancing its visibility, credibility, and engagement with its audience.

The Complainant No. 1 holds multiple domain name registrations incorporating the trademark THE ECONOMIC TIMES and its formative elements, including <economictimes.com> and <hr.economictimes.indiatimes.com>. In its effort to reach a diverse and multilingual audience across India, the Complainant No. 1 has also launched versions of its website in several Indian languages, including Hindi, Gujarati, Marathi, and others.

The disputed domain name <economictimes.ai> was registered on February 4, 2024. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page of the Registrar displaying pay-per-click (“PPC”) links.

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 Complainants contend that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainants' trademark in its entirety and is therefore identical and confusingly similar.

The Complainants assert that the Respondent has no business relationship, approval or consent from the Complainants to use the trademark THE ECONOMIC TIMES as part of the disputed domain name. The Complainants further allege that the Respondent is engaged in cybersquatting and is attempting to derive commercial gain by misleading, deceiving, and defrauding the Complainants' customers.

The Complainants contend that the Respondent was fully aware of the substantial goodwill and reputation associated with their trademark and is deliberately attempting to create a false association or nexus with the Complainants. The Complainants further submit that the passive holding of the disputed domain name by the Respondent constitutes bad faith under the Policy. The Respondent's unauthorized use of the Complainants' well-known mark within the disputed domain name further demonstrates bad faith. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention to create confusion among Internet users regarding the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website; to derive undue commercial advantage by targeting the Complainants' users; to prevent the Complainants from reflecting the mark in the corresponding domain name; and to potentially sell or transfer the disputed domain name to a competitor or third party for profit.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 3.0](#), 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 recognized that proving 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 3.0](#), 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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 the unauthorized use of the Complainant's well-known mark amounts to bad faith. The Respondent's unauthorized registration of the disputed domain name would naturally lead to a likelihood of confusion among Internet users as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website at the disputed domain name. Noting the Complainant's well-known status especially in India where the Respondent is located, and in the absence of a Response, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant in mind.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying PPC links. Noting also the composition of the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant's trademark and domain name <economictimes.com>, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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 <economictimes.ai> be transferred to Complainant No. 2 as requested by the Complainants.

/Meera Chature Sankhari/

Meera Chature Sankhari

Sole Panelist

Date: September 4, 2025