

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**Nalli Chinnasami Chetty v. RAFAEL ANDRADE NOGUEIRA**  
**Case No. D2023-1970**

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Nalli Chinnasami Chetty, India, represented by DePenning & DePenning, India.

The Respondent is RAFAEL ANDRADE NOGUEIRA, Brazil.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <nallimarketing.store> 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 May 3, 2023. On May 3, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 4, 2023, 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 (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 15, 2023, 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 May 16, 2023.

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 May 17, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 6, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 21, 2023.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on June 27, 2023. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is Nalli Chinnasami Chetty, an Indian company operating in the field of clothing, and owning several trademark registrations for NALLI, among which:

- Indian Trademark Registration No. 903809 for NALLI and design, registered on February 16, 2000;
- United States of America ("United States") Trademark Registration No. 2,444,608 for NALLI, registered on April 17, 2001;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 2,100,656 for NALLI and design, registered on September 30, 1997;
- European Union Trademark Registration No.001373786 for NALLI and design, registered on March 7, 2005;
- European Union Trademark Registration No.005690839 for NALLI and design, February 6, 2008.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its main website being "www.nalli.com".

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on February 15, 2023, and it resolves to a webpage in which it appears to be reserved to a client of the United States hosting service provider HostGator.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark NALLI.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark NALLI is known in the field of clothing. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the passive holding of the disputed domain name qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Panel finds that the Complainant is the owner of the trademark NALLI both by registration and acquired reputation and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark NALLI.

Regarding the addition of the term "marketing", the Panel notes that it is now well established that the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical terms, letters, or otherwise) to a domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark. The additional term does not therefore prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain, in this case ".store", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore met its burden of proving that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation:

"(i) before any notice to you [the respondent] of the dispute, [the respondent's ] your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services; or

(ii) [the respondent] you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) [the respondent] you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the three elements of the Policy. However, satisfying the burden of proving a lack of the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is potentially quite difficult, since proving a negative circumstance is generally more complicated than establishing a positive one. As such, it is well accepted that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of production to the Respondent. If the Respondent fails to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or on any other basis, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent, who is not currently associated with the Complainant in any way, has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use the Complainant’s trademark within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage in which it appears to be reserved to a client of the United States hosting service provider HostGator.

The *prima facie* case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, which includes the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term “marketing”, carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the facts of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that “[f]or the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that [the respondent has] registered or [has] acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [its] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [the respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

- (iv) by using the domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] web site or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location".

Regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark NALLI in the field of clothing is clearly established and the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant and its trademark, and deliberately registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As regards the current use of the disputed domain name, which is resolving to a webpage in which it appears to be reserved to a client of the United States hosting service provider HostGator, the Panel considers that bad faith may exist even in cases of so-called "passive holding", as found in the landmark UDRP decision *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#). In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. In support thereof, the Panel considers as relevant the notoriety of the Complainant's trademark in the field of clothing, the identical incorporation of said distinctive trademark, and the Respondent's failure to formally participate.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which includes the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "marketing", further support a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has presented evidence to satisfy its burden of proof with respect to the issue of whether the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

## 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, <nallimarketing.store>, be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Edoardo Fano/*

**Edoardo Fano**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 11, 2023