

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Synopsys, Inc. v. Office Rolls
Case No. D2022-2642

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Synopsys, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondent is Office Rolls, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <synopsys-inc.com> (“Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 19, 2022. On July 20, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 21, 2022, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 August 2, 2022. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 22, 2022. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 23, 2022.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on August 30, 2022. 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

Founded in 1986, the Complainant, Synopsys, Inc., is a United States corporation engaged in electronic design automation. The Complainant is a publicly-traded company employing over 16,000 employees and had over USD 4 billion in revenues in 2021.

The Complainant operates its main consumer-facing website at <synopsys.com> which it registered on June 27, 1989.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations:

Australian Trademark Registration No. 607361, SYNOPSYS, registered on July 22, 1993;
Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA458822, SYNOPSYS, registered on June, 7 1996;
European Union Trademark No. 000181172, SYNOPSYS, registered on February 1, 1999;
Indian Trademark Registration No. 603839, SYNOPSYS, registered on August 12, 1993;
Israeli Trademark Registration No. 240586, SYNOPSYS, registered on February 5, 2013;
Mexican Trademark Registration No. 619107, SYNOPSYS, registered on August 26, 1999;
New Zealand Trademark Registration No. 849059, SYNOPSYS, registered on May 25, 2012;
Singaporean Trademark Registration No. T9305475E, SYNOPSYS, registered on July 20, 1993;
Swiss Trademark Registration No. 633883, SYNOPSYS, registered on September 7, 2012;
United States Trademark Registration No. 1601521, SYNOPSYS, registered on June 12, 1990; and
United States Trademark Registration No. 1618482, SYNOPSYS, registered on October 23, 1990.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered by the Respondent on June 15, 2022, and does not resolve to an active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a provider of solutions for designing and verifying advance silicon chips, and for designing the next-generation processes and models required to manufacture those chips. Reflecting its global reach, the Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names consisting of or including its SYNOPSYS trademark, registered under various generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs), including <synopsys.com>.

The Complainant has also made substantial investments to develop a strong online presence by being active on various social-media platforms. For instance, the Complainant has over 400,000 followers on LinkedIn, 24,000 followers on Facebook, and 19,000 followers on Twitter.

Shortly after the registration of the Disputed Domain Name, the Complainant received a report that it had been used in an attempt to impersonate an officer of the Complainant in the furtherance of a fraudulent email scheme. Notably, the Respondent has made use of the email address in order to pose as the Complainant's "Director Strategic Sourcing, Procurement Operations" to place an advance order for 30 Dell Latitude 5520 laptops.

The Respondent is associated with a number of other domain names comprising third-party trademarks (or variants thereof), including <beckhoffhq.com> (BECKHOFF), <capgemini.com> (CAPGEMINI), <cbtshq.com> (CBTS), <crestronhq.com> (CRESTRON), <edgetechgrp.com> (EDGETECH), <microstratinc.com> (MICRO STRATEGIES), and <transcendus-info.com> (TRANSCEND).

The Respondent appears to have provided a false contact address in the Whois record for the Disputed Domain Name. The address used by the Respondent corresponds to the Los Angeles address of Transcend Information Inc.

The Respondent is not engaged in any legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Name. Rather, it is clear that the Respondent is making use of the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant in the furtherance of a fraudulent email scheme.

The presence of the SYNOPSIS trademark as the leading element of the Disputed Domain Name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark. The addition of the element "-inc", ostensibly as an abbreviation of the descriptive term "incorporation", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's SYNOPSIS trademark, which remains clearly recognizable in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its SYNOPSIS trademark, in a domain name or otherwise.

The Disputed Domain Name has been used to create an email address that has in turn been used in an attempt to impersonate an officer of the Complainant with a view to obtaining an advance order of 30 Dell Latitude 5520 laptops. By acting in such a manner, the Respondent has engaged in financial identity theft in order to fraudulently obtain goods from the company Dell, Inc.

There is no evidence of the Respondent having obtained any trademark rights for "synopsis", "synopsis-inc", or any variation thereof, as reflected in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent's fraudulent use of the Disputed Domain Name does not support a valid claim of being commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant's SYNOPSIS trademark is well known throughout the world, having been used by the Complainant in connection with its goods and services since 1988. As a result of its continued international use, the Complainant's SYNOPSIS trademark has acquired considerable goodwill and renown throughout the world. The Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have prior knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name in 2022, over 20 years after the Complainant's first registration of its SYNOPSIS trademark.

By registering the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent has sought to create a misleading impression of association between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant, with a view to engaging in a fraudulent email scheme, in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the famous SYNOPSIS trademark throughout the world. The addition of the term “-inc” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity as the Complainant’s SYNOPSIS mark is clearly recognizable in the Disputed Domain Name. See section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”).

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has presented a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that the Respondent obtained the Disputed Domain Name decades after the Complainant had begun using its globally famous SYNOPSIS mark indicates that the Respondent sought to piggyback on the mark for illegitimate reasons, namely, to engage in a phishing scheme targeting a vendor of the Complainant using the name of an employee of the Complainant.

After a complainant has made a *prima facie* case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

Here, the Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Regardless, the use of a domain name for illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests upon a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant’s *prima facie* case indicating the Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Name was registered years after the Complainant first registered and used its SYNOPSIS mark. The evidence provided by the Complainant makes it clear that the Respondent undoubtedly knew of the Complainant’s widely known SYNOPSIS mark, and knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

There is no benign reason for the Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark.

Currently, the Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to an active website, but this is immaterial and does not prevent a finding of bad faith as the Complainant has provided evidence that the Respondent has sent an email to a vendor attempting to impersonate the Complainant to engage in some phishing attacks. See section 3.5 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). Furthermore, the Complainant has submitted evidence that the contact information used by the Respondent when registering the Disputed Domain Name is false, and that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive registration of domain names containing third party trademarks.

The Panel finds that the only plausible basis for registering and using the Disputed Domain Name have been in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used 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 <synopsys-inc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/

Colin T. O'Brien

Sole Panelist

Date: September 13, 2022