ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Google LLC v. Amit Sehgal, Deepmindz Innovation Private Limited
Case No. DCO2026-0077

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Google LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fidus Law Chambers, India.

The Respondent is Amit Sehgal, Deepmindz Innovation Private Limited, India, represented by Saarlegal Advocates, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <deepmindz.co> 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 September 25, 2026. On September 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 28, 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 ("Amit Sehgal") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 29, 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 October 2, 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 October 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 25, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on October 22, 2026. The Complainant sent a supplemental filing on November 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on October 27, 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 Delaware, United States limited liability company having its principal place of business in California, United States. Since its formation in 1998, the Complainant has carried on business in Internet related services and products, including search, advertising, cloud computing, computer software and hardware.

The Complainant is the owner of a variety of registered trademarks for the word mark DEEPMIND, including for example (with summarized description of the applicable goods and services):

- Indian Registered Trademark Number 3059889, registered on September 20, 2015, in respect of goods and services in Classes 35 (scientific collaborations to promote advances in the field of artificial intelligence), 41 (event hosting in the field of artificial intelligence), and 42 (research and development services in the field of artificial intelligence);

- Indian Registered Trademark Number 4027148, registered on December 14, 2018, in respect of goods and services in Classes 7 (robots), 9 (scientific, electronic, and computer apparatus), 10 (medical apparatus), 12 (locomotion apparatus),16 (printed matter), 28 (toys and games), 35 (business management and administration, data compilation, analysis and processing), 38 (telecommunications, machine learning and cloud computing, augmented reality, Internet access, Internet messaging, voice services, and Internet transmission services), 41 (education and training services), 42 (scientific services including computer programming and software design, data services in connection with artificial intelligence, design and development of computer software for multiple purposes including creating and maintaining websites for others), and 44 (medical research and analysis);

- European Union Registered Trade Mark Number 014527931, registered on December 29, 2015 in Classes 35 (scientific collaborations to promote advances in the field of artificial intelligence), 41 (event hosting in the field of artificial intelligence), and 42 (research and development services in the field of artificial intelligence and computer software development).

The Complainant also provided examples of other corresponding trademarks that it possesses, which demonstrate a global portfolio of DEEPMIND marks.

The Complainant's DEEPMIND trademark is well-known globally. According to the Respondent it has not been recognized by an official determination of well-known status under applicable legislation in India. The Complainant's research under such trademark has achieved notable recognition worldwide, for example, in respect of a computer program named "AlphaGo" that plays the game "Go" in 2017, and scientific awards including for research into amino acid sequences which resulted in the individual researchers from the Complainant's DEEPMIND laboratories receiving the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 2024. Further awards were made in 2024 and 2025 in respect of weather forecasting technology, artificial intelligence impact and application, and mathematics.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <deepmind.com> registered on March 14, 2003, <deepmind.co>, registered on July 20, 2010, and <deepmind.in> (using the country code Top-Level Domain for India, where the Respondent is based) registered on June 19, 2015.

The popularity of the Complainant's DEEPMIND trademark may also be seen in the extent of its following on social media, including on "X" (formerly "Twitter") under the handle "@GoogleDeepMind", which features 1.5 million followers with a join date of January 2016, "Instagram", featuring 362,000 followers, "LinkedIn", featuring 2 million followers, and "YouTube", featuring 925,000 followers.

The Complainant runs an artificial intelligence laboratory under the name "Google DeepMind" which creates products through advances in machine learning, computing infrastructure and other scientific endeavours, together with artificial intelligence research, products, and services. Said products and services are offered under the Complainant's DEEPMIND trademark, first adopted in 2010 by the Complainant's predecessor-in-interest (a London, United Kingdom, technology company which joined forces with the Complainant in 2014). Said trademarks were assigned to the Complainant in an assignment effective December 31, 2024 (evidence provided).

Said mark has been in use on a related website at "www.deepmind.com" since at least 2012 (archive evidence provided), and is in use today at the current website, "www.deepmind.google". There are ten individual Google DeepMind laboratories globally, including one in Bangalore, India. On February 18, 2026, the Complainant announced that it was introducing national partnerships for artificial intelligence and collaboration in India, after which the Complainant launched an agricultural model using artificial intelligence for crop detection and mapping in India.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 17, 2020. The website associated with the disputed domain name is a business website for the Respondent's business, named Deepmindz Innovation, used with the strapline "Thoughtful Innovations", which states that it offers website development and "cutting-edge digital solutions", serving both global and local organizations, government institutes, and private companies. Additional products and services promoted on said site include data mining and analytics, web AR technology (the Panel assumes "AR" stands for web-based augmented reality development), WhatsApp AI, Chat Bot AI, transcription, app development, market research, voice application, digital transformation products, bespoke software development solutions, and healthcare software development services. Where "AI" is mentioned, the Panel assumes this to refer to artificial intelligence. The Complainant shows that the earliest available entry for the Respondent's website from the Internet Archive "Wayback Machine" is dated November 29, 2021.

The Respondent additionally notes in its submissions that it provides global capability centers (dedicated teams in India, together with infrastructure, facilities, and management), and robotic solutions for warehousing and logistics.

The Respondent's business operates under the company Deepmindz Innovations Private Limited, a company incorporated in India on December 30, 2019, registered as a small enterprise under the corresponding legislation, and as a startup in the "IT services" and "IT consulting" categories under the relevant governmental scheme. The Panel treats the term "the Respondent" as both the individual and the company unless the context otherwise indicates. The Respondent's position as outlined in its contentions is that it has made an honest adoption and use of its business name.

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 Complainant's DEEPMIND trademark is well-known on account of "monumental recognitions" dating back to the "AlphaGo" project in 2017, and that it is popular as exemplified by its social media presence, and coverage received in the mainstream media. The Complainant also relies upon various cases which it has brought under the Policy concerning domain names targeting the said trademark.

With regard to the three elements of the Policy, the Complainant first asserts that the disputed domain name entirely subsumes the Complainant's said trademark, leaving it confusingly similar thereto, and that the addition of a letter "z" does not affect the overall impression, whereby the DEEPMIND mark remains the dominant part. The Complainant also cites section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on

Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1") in respect of the typographical variant of the mark which it contends is found in the disputed domain name.

With regard to the second element of the Policy, the Complainant submits that it has not authorized, assigned, licensed, transferred, sold or in any way permitted the Respondent to use its trademark, adding that the Respondent's significantly post-dating adoption and use of said mark is made solely with a view to mislead and divert consumers and Internet traffic towards the Respondent's website, by unjustly riding upon the goodwill and reputation subsisting in the Complainant's trademark, especially in the field of artificial intelligence. It goes on to assert that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that it is improbable that the Respondent's adoption of a confusingly similar domain name for artificial intelligence related services is coincidental, bearing in mind that the Complainant's groundbreaking developments in artificial intelligence have been well received by consumers and the public for years. It further contends that the composition of the Respondent's website falsely and misleadingly suggests an association with the Complainant's website for AI research laboratory services under the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent deliberately incorporated the Complainant's well-known DEEPMIND trademark into the disputed domain name subsequent to the Complainant's use and registration of said mark. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent did so in an attempt to draw consumers to its associated website and that it featured the mark in an attempt to profit from an illusion of association with the Complainant. The Complainant asserts that this meets the bad faith requirements set forth in the Policy and also amounts to infringement of the Complainant's registered trademark. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent, through its website at the disputed domain name, is attempting to pass itself off as an extension of Google DeepMind AI research laboratory and to appear as a legitimate website offering services which can easily be linked to the Complainant. The Complainant notes that the Respondent's website fails to mention or disclose that no commercial connection exists between it and the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that paragraph 2 of the Policy implicitly requires a registrant to make some good faith effort to avoid registering and using domain names corresponding to trademarks and submits that the obligations imposed by paragraph 2 are an integral part of the Policy applicable to all registrants and cannot be ignored.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. In relation to the first element, in summary, it contends that the disputed domain name is not identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, as it submits that the Complainant's mark, as used in trade, is GOOGLE DEEPMIND, which differs from the disputed domain name in spelling, structure, and overall impression. It further contends that DEEPMINDZ is not a misspelling of the Complainant's mark but rather a deliberately chosen name for the Respondent's company, where the final "z" denotes the plural "minds", forms part of the Respondent Company's registered name and has been used since 2020 with the tagline "Thoughtful Innovations" and its original logo consisting of two heads.

With regard to the second element, the Respondent contends that the Respondent company was incorporated on December 30, 2019 and the disputed domain name was registered for its use on January 17, 2020. The Respondent asserts that the disputed domain name has been used continuously since then for the Respondent company's business website and official email addresses, and it therefore claims that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as it has used the name "Deepmindz" in connection with a bona fide offering of services and it is commonly known by that name.

The Respondent notes that its website does not make any reference to the Complainant's logo, get-up or content, and carries no advertisements, pay-per-click links or redirections. It submits that there is therefore no evidence that the Respondent seeks to divert consumers and web-traffic, or that the composition of its website suggests an association with the Complainant. The Respondent also denies that it uses the

disputed domain name wrongfully for commercial gain, asserting that the Complainant has provided no evidence of any consumer confusion, unjust gain by the Respondent or any redirection of the Complainant's traffic to the Respondent.

The Respondent further submits that its use of the disputed domain name, which corresponds to its own company name, is a fair use, made without any intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark, noting that the website clearly identifies the Respondent Company as its owner and does not impersonate the Complainant or suggest any sponsorship by it.

With regard to the third element of the Policy, the Respondent contends that the Complainant has failed to prove that the Respondent must have known of and targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. In particular, it contends that when the disputed domain name was registered, the Respondent company had already been incorporated under its name, and the disputed domain name was registered to match that name. It asserts that the Complainant became the proprietor of the trademark DEEPMIND only on December 31, 2024, its present website using the domain name <deepmind.google> was registered only on September 7, 2023, and its Indian initiatives date from 2026. The Respondent contends that as DEEPMIND is made up of dictionary words and is not a coined term, no presumption of bad faith can arise from the registration of the Respondent's own name, and that knowledge of a third party, even if it were assumed, is not the same as targeting it.

The Respondent further notes that it has never offered the disputed domain name for sale or made any demands in respect of it, nor was it registered to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its mark in a domain name, noting that the Complainant already holds the domain names <deepmind.com>, <deepmind.in>, <deepmind.google>, and <deepmind.co>. The Respondent asserts that it holds no domain name corresponding to the Complainant's mark or to the trademark of any third party and has never been a party to any other domain name dispute.

The Respondent asserts that its use of the disputed domain name is bona fide as it operates in a different area of work, offers different services and has never represented itself to be connected to the Complainant. It submits that it is not a competitor of the Complainant and did not register the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the Complainant's business, arguing that in more than six years of open and continuous use by the Respondent of the disputed domain name, the Complainant has not evidenced any lost business, diverted customers, misdirected communications or any other disruption to its business caused by said use.

The Respondent contends that the expression "deep mind(s)" is also used by many unrelated businesses for technology and software services, such as DeepMind Creations (<deepminds.xyz>), DeepMinds (<deepminds.me>) and Deepminds Infotech Pvt. Ltd. (<deepmindsinfotech.com>) which it submits supports its case that the disputed domain name is derived from a common English phrase and affirms its lack of intent to pass itself off as the Complainant or to target it.

The Respondent denies that the Complainant's mark is well-known in India, asserting that in India, a trademark is recognized as "well known" only upon a determination by a court or by the Registrar of Trade Marks, that DEEPMIND has never been so recognized and that it does not appear in the list of well-known trademarks maintained by the Indian Trade Marks Registry, although the Complainant's mark GOOGLE does.

The Respondent seeks a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue: Complainant's Supplemental Filing

Paragraph 12 of the Rules expressly provides that it is for the panel to request, in its sole discretion, any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case. Unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.6.

In terms of paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, panels have sole discretion whether to accept an unsolicited supplemental filing from either party, bearing in mind the need for procedural efficiency, and the obligation to treat each party with equality and ensure that each party has a fair opportunity to present its case. The party submitting a supplemental filing would normally need to show its relevance to the case and explain why it was unable to provide that information in the complaint or response (for example, owing to some exceptional circumstance).

As noted in the procedural history section above, the Complainant filed a supplemental filing on November 5, 2026. This filing sought to introduce new evidence relating to the Respondent's alleged interest in and past activity relating to artificial intelligence. The Panel takes the view that this additional material adds nothing that would substantially affect the outcome of the proceeding, as determined by the Panel's assessment of the Complaint and Response alone, whereby a delay would be justified in order to provide the Respondent with a right of reply to said filing. Consequently, the Panel declines to admit said filing and will proceed to a Decision.

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 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. 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.

The applicable Top-Level Domain in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") (here, ".co") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms, here, the letter "z", 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.

As to the points made by the Respondent that the Complainant's DEEPMIND trademark is a combination of two dictionary words, and that the "z" in the Respondent's business name connotes a plural aspect missing in said mark, these contentions are better addressed under the second and third elements under the Policy.

The Respondent's contentions regarding the overall impression of the Complainant's mark when compared to the Respondent's business name are also not relevant to the first element assessment. Issues such as the strength of the complainant's mark or the respondent's intent to provide its own legitimate offering of goods or services without trading off the complainant's reputation, are decided under the second and third

elements. Panels view the first element as a threshold test concerning a trademark owner's standing to file a UDRP complaint, i.e., to ascertain whether there is a sufficient nexus between the mark and domain name to proceed to an assessment of the second and third elements. 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 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, based upon its submissions that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that it is improbable that the Respondent's adoption of a confusingly similar domain name for artificial intelligence related services is coincidental, bearing in mind that the Complainant's groundbreaking developments in artificial intelligence have been well received by consumers and the public for years.

The primary issue noted in the Respondent's attempted rebuttal of the Complainant's case on the second element is the fact that the disputed domain name matches the Respondent's company name, in connection with which the Respondent company was incorporated on December 30, 2019, and the disputed domain name was registered for its use on January 17, 2020. However, even when officially registered, a corporate name does not typically, on its own, lead to a finding of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy (*Royal Bank of Canada v. RBC Bank*, WIPO Case No. D2002-0672). Furthermore, although evidence of the registration of a business name may be submitted to support a respondent's case, panels are not likely to give a mere business name registration the same weight as a trademark registration, and would expect evidence of use of the business name (beyond mere corporate registration documents) to also be provided in a way that links the business name to the source of specific goods or services. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.12.1.

Here, the Respondent asserts that it uses the name "Deepmindz" in connection with a bona fide offering of services, as exemplified on the website associated with the disputed domain name. However, in the Panel's view, such offering of services may not be considered to be bona fide in the present case if it is made under a name that is wholly derivative of and confusingly similar to the Complainant's distinctive trademark. On this subject, the Respondent states that its website does not refer to the Complainant's logo, get-up, or content. The problem for the Respondent's case is that, while these assertions may or may not be true, the use of a business name and disputed domain name comprising a pluralized version (the "z" corresponding to the letter "s" in pronunciation terms) of the Complainant's prominent, distinctive and globally well-known DEEPMIND trademark, in connection with services for which that mark is registered (including in India, where the Respondent is based) means that the Respondent is likely to benefit unfairly from its association with such mark, or from an impression of endorsement by the mark owner. This cannot lead to the Respondent's services being considered to be a bona fide offering in the circumstances of this case.

A comparison of the services listed on the Respondent's website with those for which the Complainant's mark is registered shows that there is a considerable cross-over whereby confusion is likely to arise. Most notably, this relates to the provision of artificial intelligence services, but it also includes services such as computer programming and software design, data services, robotics, and design and development of computer software for creating and maintaining websites. In this context, it matters not whether the Complainant's mark has attained the status of an officially recognized well-known mark in any particular jurisdiction. What is important for present purposes is the notoriety of that mark among the relevant public (which the Panel accepts to be established on the evidence here).
The Respondent notes that the Complainant has not provided any evidence of customer confusion, but this misunderstands the position under the Policy. If there is a likelihood of confusion that has been engineered by the Respondent (as the Panel finds, given the similarity of the Respondent's name to the Complainant's mark and the identity of some of the Parties' services) that is sufficient to mean that the offering of services falls short of being bona fide. It is not necessary that actual confusion be demonstrated. It should also be borne in mind that the requirements of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy include that the offering of services must have been made before any notice of the dispute. This does not necessarily mean before notification of the Complaint under the Policy, and such notice encompasses the Respondent's likely awareness of the fame of the Complainant's mark prior to registering the disputed domain name, which on the evidence, the Panel reasonably infers.

The Panel does not accept the notion that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name (and its company name) based upon a coincidence, i.e., because the Respondent allegedly combined the dictionary words "deep" and "mind" and added the letter "z", independently of any awareness of the Complainant's mark. In any event, panels have held that merely registering a domain name comprised of a dictionary word or phrase would not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the respondent. Mere arguments that a domain name corresponds to a dictionary term/phrase may not be sufficient, and panels will consider the overall facts and circumstances of the case when assessing such arguments. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.10.1. Here, considering the totality of the factual matrix, it cannot be overlooked that the Respondent's business is active in the field of computer services and artificial intelligence whereby any suggestion that the Respondent would not have heard of the Complainant's activities (or those of its predecessor) under the DEEPMIND trademark before it registered the disputed domain name are insufficiently persuasive on the balance of probabilities. The Respondent claims to apply artificial intelligence to computer software and data analysis services, as does the Complainant. Given the Parties' overlapping commercial fields, the Respondent's business name is unlikely to be perceived independently of the Complainant's trademark. This may be distinguished, for example, from the situation of a business in an unrelated field which happens to use artificial intelligence as a tool in its business. Such use therefore cannot confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent in the circumstances of this case.

The Panel notes that the Respondent argues that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The expression "commonly known by" is usually interpreted by panels under the Policy as meaning that a respondent must have been commonly known by at least some other people than those responsible for the disputed domain name prior to its registration. Equally, the adoption of such name must be unconnected with and wholly independent from any reference to the complainant. There is no evidence before the Panel to this effect, and indeed, the evidence points in the opposite direction regarding the issue of the disputed domain name's reference to the Complainant.

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. Panels under the Policy have typically determined that for bad faith registration and use to be made out there must be a degree of targeting of a complainant or its mark, or at the very least that a respondent must have had the complainant or its trademark in mind when selecting the domain name concerned.

In the present case, the Panel's assessment largely follows that of the second element above. The Complainant's DEEPMIND mark gained substantial notoriety upon the acquisition of the Complainant's predecessor in interest in 2014. Further notoriety was achieved between 2015 and 2017 with the launch of the DEEPMIND AlphaGo project, whereby the DEEPMIND AlphaGo team received the first IJCAI Marvin Minsky Medal for outstanding achievements in artificial intelligence, described in an independent media article in the Complainant's Annexes as "[…] a breathtaking demonstration of contemporary AI". The notion that the Respondent, as a person interested in artificial intelligence who went on to found a business specializing in the relevant tools some two years later in 2019, had not heard of the Complainant's DEEPMIND mark and came by the disputed domain name independently is not credible. The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's said mark.

The Panel notes that knowledge of a complainant's mark, taken alone, is not necessarily sufficient to establish targeting for the purposes of the Policy. In the present case, however, there are additional factors which point in that direction. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's mark in its entirety together with only the letter "z", the allegedly plural aspect of which does nothing of any substance to distinguish it in visual, phonetic or conceptual terms. Furthermore, the Respondent did not adopt the disputed domain name in connection with an unrelated field of activity but rather in connection with services which overlap substantially with those for which the Complainant's mark is registered and has achieved notoriety, including artificial intelligence, software development, data services and related technology offerings. In these circumstances, and absent any persuasive independent and credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of name, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the disputed domain name was selected because of its association with the Complainant's mark and the goodwill attaching thereto, and hence that targeting intent is established on the Respondent's part.

There is no significance in the short interval between the founding of the Respondent's company (December 30, 2019) and the registration date of the disputed domain name (January 17, 2020). As far as targeting is concerned, the substantial notoriety garnered by the Complainant's DEEPMIND mark in the relevant field well before both the former and the latter date indicates that the Respondent had much to gain by associating itself with it in connection with a business operating in related fields, and, on the balance of probabilities, was aware of this and selected the disputed domain name accordingly.

The Panel is satisfied that the addition of the letter "z" to the Complainant's mark by the Respondent is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from said mark, whereby there remains a substantial likelihood of confusion from which, as noted above, the Respondent more probably than not expected to benefit. While the Respondent argues that the Google searches it produces show that confusion is unlikely to arise, the Panel notes that the searches presented are "personalized" results, meaning that they are influenced by the searcher's Google account and search history, and any previous interactions with specific websites (which would include interactions with the Respondent's own website). This evidence does not serve to show what a person might see without such personalized influences being applied, and therefore does not alter the Panel's position on the issue of likelihood of confusion.

There is likewise no significance in the Respondent's contention that the Complainant became the proprietor of the DEEPMIND trademark only on December 31, 2024, and that its present website using the domain name <deepmind.google> was registered only on September 7, 2023. The Complainant is the successor in interest to the trademark, which mark and its notoriety dates back years, and indeed, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant likely contributed in large measure to the notoriety of such mark when it acquired the previous proprietor in 2014, long before the disputed domain name was registered. Furthermore, the evidence before the Panel demonstrates that the official domain name of the previous proprietor of said mark was <deepmind.com> from at least 2012, whereby the notoriety arising, for example, from the DEEPMIND AlphaGo project, would at the time more probably than not have been linked to the website associated with that domain name as well as to the DEEPMIND trademark now owned by the Complainant. The fact the Complainant's Indian initiatives may not have commenced until later is beside the point, and, as the Complainant's media coverage suggests, would not have influenced the extent of its notoriety. Crucially, its Indian trademarks were in force long before the disputed domain name was registered.

In any event, even if the Complainant had not been active in India at the material date, as the panel noted in *Fakir Elektrikli EV Aletleri Diş Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. Development Services, Telepathy, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2016-0535, "the fact that a respondent is in a different jurisdiction than a complainant is something that some people can consider to be of greater significance than it actually is, particularly if the complainant has a significant online presence". In the present case, the significance of the Complainant's online presence (including in connection with it and its predecessor's activities under the DEEPMIND trademark dating back to 2012) is undeniable, and the Respondent has not advanced any persuasive argument to the contrary.

As noted in the preceding section, the fact that the term DEEPMIND is made up of dictionary words and is not a coined term does not automatically lead to the conclusion that the registration and use of the disputed domain name is not in bad faith. The Respondent states that knowledge of a third party, even if it were assumed, is not the same as targeting it, but as noted above, targeting may be inferred in this case by the fact that (1) the Parties are in overlapping fields of commercial activity, and (2) a person in the position of the Respondent could reasonably expect to benefit commercially from the substantial goodwill brought about by the notoriety of the Complainant's mark if it registered a domain name that is confusingly similar to such mark for a related business, as is the disputed domain name. The fact that the Respondent may hold no other domain names corresponding to third party trademarks and has never been a party to any other domain name dispute would not exculpate it in the circumstances of the present case.

The Respondent presents evidence that the expression "deep mind(s)" is used by three other entities, which it describes as "many unrelated businesses" for technology and software services. It further describes this as "widespread third-party use". In the first place, uses by third parties whether by way of legitimate coexistence, license, partnership, or even infringing uses, would not exculpate a person in the position of the Respondent in the circumstances of this case. Secondly, three additional uses do not support any notion of widespread adoption by others which would tend to suggest that the phrase "deep mind(s)" has any dictionary meaning whereby it has been independently reached by either the said third parties or the Respondent. More substantial evidence, such as multiple examples of genuinely widespread use across a large variety of businesses and possibly also the use of the phrase in multiple third-party trademarks would be needed to support the notion that the disputed domain name is derived from a common English phrase as opposed to from the Complainant's mark. Sufficient evidence of multiple linguistic uses of the term as a phrase would potentially do the same job. In the absence of such, this aspect of the Respondent's case falls to be rejected.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.16.

Given that the Panel has found in the Complainant's favor, it does not require to address itself to the Respondent's request for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. The Panel finds that the Complaint has not been brought in bad faith.

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 <deepmindz.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/
Andrew D. S. Lothian
Sole Panelist
Date: November 10, 2026