



मध्य प्रदेश MADHYA PRADESH

DF 515831

**BEFORE THE ARBITRATOR RAJESH BISARIA**  
**UNDER THE**  
**.IN DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY (INDRP)**  
**[NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA (NIXI)]**

**ARBITRAL AWARD**

**Date-13.02.2026**

**Disputed Domain Name: [www.amazonstorelogistic.in](http://www.amazonstorelogistic.in)**

**INDRP Case No -2066**

**THE PARTIES**

(1) The Complainant is Amazon Technologies, Inc., 410 Terry Avenue North, Seattle , Washington 98109 , United States of America

The Respondent is Abhishek Kumar Gobardhan Ram Ramashish Prasad Gupta Jewellers, Gram-Sohjana, Post Jhajha, Bihar - 811308



मध्य प्रदेश MADHYA PRADESH

DF 515832

**THE DOMAIN NAME AND REGISTRAR**

(2)

- (a) This dispute concerns to the domain name **www.amazonestorelogistic.in**
- (b) The Registrar with whom the disputed domain name is registered is indicated as:  
Registrar's Name: GoDaddy.com, LLC , Registrar Address:14455 N Hayden Rd Ste 226, Scottsdale, AZ 85260-6993, Telephone Number:(480) 505-8800 , Fax Number:(480) 624-2546, Email Address: udrpdisputes@godaddy.com; reg\_admin@godaddy.com. This was registered on 20.08.2024

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

(3)

The NIXI appointed RAJESH BISARIA as Arbitrator from its panel as per paragraph 5(b) of INDRP Rules of procedure	17.11.2025
Arbitral proceedings were commenced by sending notice to Respondent through e-mail as per paragraph 5(c) of INDRP Rules of Procedure, marking a copy of the same to Complainant's authorized representative and NIXI.	17.11.2025

Due date of submission of Statement of Claim by Complainant (instructed by mail dated 17.11.2025)	28.11.2025
Complainant 's response by submitting their Statement of Claim to AT- Soft copy Hard copy	25.11.2025 01.12.2025
Complainant 's response by submitting their Statement of Claim along with all annexures to Respondent- <b>Soft copy -</b> Complainant sent the copy of complaint along with all annexures to Respondent vide their mail dated 25.11.2025 and stated that <i>-we are forwarding a soft copy of the INDRP Complaint along with Annexures 1 - 15 for your and the Respondent's attention.</i> Complainant vide their mail dated 28.11.2025 and stated that <i>- Soft copy of the INDRP Complaint along with Annexures 1 - 15 have been delivered on the Respondent. A copy of the delivery receipt is attached.</i> <b>Hard copy -</b> Complainant sent the copy of complaint along with all annexures to Respondent and intimated vide their mail dated 25.11.2025 that <i>- hard copies of the entire set of the INDRP Complaint along with Annexures 1 - 15 has also been sent to postal address of Respondent via India Post (Shipment No. ED886053322IN). Tracking receipts attached.</i> Complainant vide their mail dated 08.12.2025 and stated that <i>- The hard copy of the INDRP Complaint along with Annexures 1 - 15 have been returned to origin as the Respondent has shifted from the residence. A copy of the courier tracking report (Shipment No. ED886053322IN) is attached. However, since the soft copy of the same have been delivered on the Respondent (as</i>	25.11.2025 28.11.2025



<p><i>apprised in our email below), this would constitute as adequate service upon them.</i></p> <p>The delivery report submitted by Complainant shows that on 08.12.2025, Returned to sender-addressee left without instructions.</p>	
Due date of submission of Statement of Defense by Respondent as instructed by AT mail dated 17.11.2025	09.12.2025
Respondent's response by submitting their Statement of Defense against the due date of submission	Not submitted
Complainant's response by submitting their Rejoinder	Not required
<p>AT by their mail dated 11.01.2026 stated and informed all concerning that- <i>Respondent was directed to file the Soft copy (PDF &amp; Editable) and the Hard copy of 'Reply of the said complete complaint (Statement of Defense)' on or before 09.12.2025. But Respondent failed to file the same by this time limit and even by today. Respondent has also not filed any application for the grant of extension of time for this submission. Since sufficient opportunity was given to Respondent to submit their pleading, therefore their right to submit the same is stand forfeited and no further opportunity shall be granted in this regard. The proceeding of this case is kept closed for award and the matter would be decided ex-parte on the basis of the documents on record with this tribunal as per INDRP policy.</i></p>	11.01.2026
The language of the proceedings	English

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

### (4) The Complainant:

The Complainant is Amazon Technologies, Inc., 410 Terry Avenue North, Seattle, Washington 98109 , United States of America, E-mail: ipr@archerangel.com, Tel: +91-11 41954195, Fax: +91-11 41954196

**The Complainant's authorized representative in this administrative proceeding is:**

Mr. Sanjay Chhabra, Archer & Angel, #5B, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Commercial Towers, Hotel J W Marriott, Aerocity , New Delhi – 110037 , India , Tel: +91-11 41954195, Fax: +91-11 41954196, Email: schhabra@archerangel.com

**The Complainant's preferred method of communication directed to the Complainant in this administrative proceeding is:**

Medium: Not provided

Address: Not provided

Concerned Person's Name: Not provided

**(5) The Respondent:**

The Respondent is Abhishek Kumar Gobardhan Ram Ramashish Prasad Gupta Jewellers, Gram-Sohjana, Post Jhajha, Bihar – 811308 and Email-sangitadevi700109@gmail.com

**(6) Complainant's Activities:**

(a) In 1994, the Complainant's Founder Jeff Bezos developed an innovative plan to sell a wide selection of books over the Internet. The Complainant opened its virtual doors in July 1995, offering retail store services *via* the website www.amazon.com. Today, the Complainant is a leading retailer offering a wide variety of products and services. Due to extensive advertising, use, and commercial success, the **AMAZON** trademark has become famous and is consistently ranked as one of the most well-known and recognizable brands globally. Documents evidencing the above statements are collectively enclosed as **Annexure 3**.

(b) An illustrative list of registrations owned by the Complainant in India is as below:



S. No.	Trademark	Registration No.	Registration Date	Class
1.	AMAZON	916801	2000-04-10	01
2.	AMAZON	916802	2000-04-10	02
3.	AMAZON	916803	2000-04-10	03
4.	AMAZON	916804	2000-04-10	04
5.	AMAZON	916805	2000-04-10	05
6.	AMAZON	916806	2000-04-10	06
7.	AMAZON	916807	2000-04-10	07
8.	AMAZON	916808	2000-04-10	08
9.	AMAZON	916809	2000-04-10	09
10.	AMAZON	916810	2000-04-10	10
11.	AMAZON	916811	2000-04-10	11
12.	AMAZON	916812	2000-04-10	12
13.	AMAZON	916813	2000-04-10	13
14.	AMAZON	916814	2000-04-10	14
15.	AMAZON	916815	2000-04-10	15
16.	AMAZON	916816	2000-04-10	16
17.	AMAZON	916817	2000-04-10	17
18.	AMAZON	916818	2000-04-10	18
19.	AMAZON	916819	2000-04-10	19
20.	AMAZON	916820	2000-04-10	20
21.	AMAZON	916821	2000-04-10	21
22.	AMAZON	916822	2000-04-10	22
23.	AMAZON	916823	2000-04-10	23
24.	AMAZON	916824	2000-04-10	24



25.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916825	2000-04-10	25
26.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916826	2000-04-10	26
27.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916827	2000-04-10	27
28.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916828	2000-04-10	28
29.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916829	2000-04-10	29
30.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916830	2000-04-10	30
31.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916831	2000-04-10	31
32.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916832	2000-04-10	32
33.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916833	2000-04-10	33
34.	<b>AMAZON</b>	916834	2000-04-10	34
35.	<b>AMAZON</b>	1238450	2003-09-19	35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42
36.	<b>AMAZON</b>	1861493	2009-09-11	42
37.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2534177	2013-05-20	09
38.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2534388	2013-05-20	41
39.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2583003	2013-08-21	09
40.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2583004	2013-08-21	36
41.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2583005	2013-08-21	38
42.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2640730	2013-12-10	45
43.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2835753	2014-10-31	38
44.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2835754	2014-10-31	41
45.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2835755	2014-10-31	09
46.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2835756	2014-10-31	38
47.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2835757	2014-10-31	41
48.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2835758	2014-10-31	42

49.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2836172	2014-10-31	09
50.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2846255	2014-11-19	45
51.	<b>AMAZON</b>	2846256	2014-11-19	35
52.	<b>AMAZON</b>	3986032	2018-09-21	10
53.	<b>AMAZON</b>	4049638	2019-01-08	43
54.	<b>AMAZON</b>	4049639	2019-01-08	44
55.	<b>AMAZON</b>	4300715	2019-09-23	09
56.	<b>AMAZON</b>	4300716	2019-09-23	38
57.	<b>AMAZON</b>	4300717	2019-09-23	42
58.	<b>AMAZON</b>	5557749	2022-08-04	9
59.	<b>AMAZON</b>	5557751	2022-08-04	10
60.	<b>AMAZON</b>	5557752	2022-08-04	42
61.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328789	2024-03-01	03
62.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328790	2024-03-01	05
63.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328791	2024-03-01	10
64.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328792	2024-03-01	28
65.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328793	2024-03-01	35
66.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328794	2024-03-01	39
67.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328795	2024-03-01	41
68.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328796	2024-03-01	42
69.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328797	2024-03-01	44
70.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6328798	2024-03-01	45
71.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6356307	2024-03-20	2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 19, 21

72.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6356308	2024-03-20	12, 15, 18, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27
73.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6356310	2024-03-20	40, 43
74.	<b>AMAZON</b>	6686291	2024-03-20	29, 31, 32 & 33

**(7) Complainant's Trade Marks and Domain Names:**

- (a) The Complainant adopted the trademark **AMAZON** in an honest and *bonafide* manner and debuted it in international commerce in the U.S.A. in 1995. Since then, the Complainant's growth as a company has been mirrored by the exposure and familiarity of its corporate name, brand and house mark **AMAZON**. As a result, the Complainant's **AMAZON** brand has received widespread acclaim and recognition as one of the most recognized and highly valued brands in the world. In 2024 and 2025 itself, the Complainant has been included in the TIME Magazine's TIME100 Most Influential Companies and Fortune's America's Most Innovative Companies. Fortune ranked the Complainant as No. 3 in the World's Most Admired Companies list in 2024 and 2025 and No. 4 in Most Valuable Brands List in 2020. The Opponent has further been ranked third by Interbrand in global brand rankings for the years 2024, 2023 and 2022 and ranked second in 2021. In India, the Complainant's online retail website [www.amazon.in](http://www.amazon.in) became the most visited e-commerce site in India with more than 200 million visitors in 2015, was recognized as the "most trusted, preferred and loved online shopping brand in India" based on a commissioned Nielsen Media India survey in 2023 and was even voted India's most trusted online shopping brand for the second consecutive year by TRA's Brand Trust Report in 2016. Extracts of pages supporting these claims are collectively enclosed as **Annexure 4**.



- (b) To safeguard its current and future interests, the Complainant has sought and secured statutory protection of its trademark **AMAZON**, including in word and device / logo form as well as in many other variations - hereinafter collectively referred to as the "**AMAZON Marks**", in numerous jurisdictions worldwide. Copies of a few selective Registration Certificates, issued for the mark **AMAZON per se** in India and the USA, are collectively enclosed as **Annexure 5**. It is relevant to mention that the earliest registration in the mark **AMAZON** internationally dates back to the year **1995** and in India to the year **2000**.
- (c) The Complainant owns the domain name <**amazon.com**> and operates its corresponding primary website at [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com), through which it conducts a significant portion of its business and where information about it and its business is easily accessible and available to millions of internet users, who may be current or potential consumers. As is evident, the Complainant's domain name completely incorporates its registered trademark **AMAZON** in its entirety. The aforementioned domain name was registered on and has been regularly renewed since **November 01, 1994**, becoming so synonymous with the Complainant that it also forms the operative part of the corporate name of the Complainant's parent company - Amazon.com, Inc. Extracts from the WHOIS database, in support of the above submissions, are collectively enclosed as **Annexure 6**.
- (d) The Complainant is also the owner of India specific domain names <**amazon.in**> and <**amazon.co.in**> - which were registered and have been regularly renewed since **February 11, 2005** and **December 31, 2003** respectively. It further operates the website at [www.amazon.in](http://www.amazon.in) - which is dedicated to the Indian market and consumers. Extracts from the WHOIS database along with a few webpages from the Complainant's Indian website, corroborating the above information, are collectively enclosed as **Annexure 7**. These domains and website have embodied the Complainant's business in India since it was first launched here in June 2013, and which has grown to become one of India's most trusted online retail platforms.
- (e) As a result of and to leverage its internet-based business model, the Complainant has also set up several other dedicated country-specific top

level domain names and websites in major markets through which it ships products to nearly every corner of the world. A few of such domains have been mentioned below:

Domain Name	Country	Registration Date
<amazon.com.au>	Australia	November 07, 2019
<amazon.com.br>	Brazil	September 27, 1995
<amazon.ca>	Canada	September 19, 2000
<amazon.cn>	China	March 17, 2003
<amazon.fr>	France	April 16, 2008
<amazon.it>	Italy	February 10, 2000
<amazon.co.jp>	Japan	November 21, 2002
<amazon.com.mx>	Mexico	October 29, 1997
<amazon.nl>	Netherlands	April 14, 1998
<amazon.sg>	Singapore	January 03, 2005
<amazon.se>	Sweden	July 03, 1997
<amazon.com.tr>	Turkey	February 05, 1998
<amazon.co.uk>	United Kingdom	August, 1996

Relevant extracts from the WHOIS database, in support of the above submission, are collectively enclosed as **Annexure 8**.

- (f) The Complainant has ensured significant presence and visibility of the **AMAZON** Marks in the market through various promotional and advertising activities. The services under the **AMAZON** Marks are prominently advertised on the Complainant's social media accounts on Facebook, X, and YouTube. As of July 2025, Amazon's Facebook page dedicated to its **AMAZON** brand has been followed by 29,000,000 users, while its Indian counterpart has 10,000,000 followers; its X account has 6 million followers, while its India specific account has over 2.5 million followers; its YouTube account has more than 974 thousand followers, while its Indian specific account has more than 1.56 million followers; and finally, its LinkedIn account has more than 35 million followers - all of whom may arguably be considered as the Complainant's potential if not existing customers. It is pertinent to note that the **AMAZON** Mark in its entirety is present in the names of the aforementioned social media accounts. Given the fact that these websites attract masses from every social, geographical, economic and age demographic worldwide, the **AMAZON** Marks have consequently been exposed to an exponentially larger section of both the Indian and global public. In addition, the Complainant also makes available to public its products and services *via* mobile applications on *inter alia* the two most prominent mobile platforms in the world - Apple (iTunes) and Android (Google Play Store) - where the **AMAZON** Mark is prominently used,

including in form of the app icon / thumbnail. Extracts of relevant webpages, in support of the above submissions, are collectively enclosed as **Annexure 9**.

- (g) Besides the Complainant's own efforts, its business and promotional events under the **AMAZON** Marks have been covered and widely publicized by a number of independent media outlets such as First Post, The Economic Times, News18, NDTV, The Hindustan Times, India TV News, Times Now News, India Today, Tech Crunch, Live Mint, Digit.in, Financial Express, Business Insider, and Forbes to name a few. Relevant extracts, in support of the above submissions, are collectively enclosed as **Annexure 10**.
- (h) The Complainant is dedicated towards innovating to fulfil the needs of Indian consumers, either through devices or unique offerings like Cash on Delivery and Secure Delivery. The Complainant empowers small and medium sized businesses to reach millions of customers through its various programmes that help boost their revenue, reach and productivity. The Complainant presently has invested in building a network of more than 70 Fulfilment Centres across 15 states with a combined storage space of more than 43 million cubic feet and a provision to provide ample space for 8.5 million sellers. Further, the Complainant has close to 2000 delivery stations both owned and operated by the Complainant as well as Delivery Service Partners, 350 Service Partners nodes, and 28,000 'I Have Spaces' stores in the country. Moreover, for ease of vernacular language speaking Indians, the Complainant has made its website and mobile applications available in local languages such as Hindi, Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil, Telugu, Marathi and Bengali. Further, over the years, the Complainant's seller base has grown to over 12 lakhs in India itself. This clearly shows how committed the Complainant is in catering its ordering and delivery services to almost every part of India.
- (i) The Complainant's **AMAZON** Marks were adopted in an honest and *bonafide* manner, and by virtue of conspicuous commercial presence globally for several decades now, have amassed an unrivalled reputation, acquiring such a degree of distinctiveness in the market that members of the trade and public inextricably link the **AMAZON** Marks with the Complainant. The **AMAZON** Marks, therefore, have generated enormous goodwill worldwide, including in India, and have consequently become radically distinctive to the Complainant's products and services. By virtue of extensive and continuous use of the **AMAZON** Marks by the Complainant worldwide, including in India, they are liable to be recognized as "well-known" marks within the meaning of Section 2(1)(zg) and the provisions of Section 11(6) of The Trade Marks Act, 1999.
- (j) In light of these filings and the Complainant's substantial and exclusive use of the **AMAZON** Marks, the Complainant owns protectable rights in the **AMAZON** Marks that predate the registration date of the Disputed Domain Name.

- (k) The Complainant recently learnt of the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name and use of its corresponding website at [www.amazonstorelogistic.in](http://www.amazonstorelogistic.in) ("impugned website"). On the said website, the Respondent is using several of the Complainant's **AMAZON** Marks - as trademarks, trade names, and even part of email addresses, claiming to provide the Complainant's services to consumers. The impugned website even has a section under the 'Opportunity' heading, whose content is identical to that on the Complainant's official website. Extracts from the impugned website, in support of the above submissions, are enclosed as **Annexure 11**.
- (l) The Complainant firmly believes in exploring the possibility of an amicable resolution of differences before initiating any legal action. Therefore, a letter dated April 07, 2025 was issued to the Respondent on the Complainant's behalf, calling upon the former to transfer the Disputed Domain Name to the Complainant among other reasonable requests. Copy of the said letter is enclosed as **Annexure 12**. However, till date, the Respondent has not sent any response to the Complainant's letter and continues to keep the Disputed Domain Name active / hold its ownership and operate the impugned website - which indicates bad faith on part of the Respondent.

**(8) Respondent's Identity and activities:**

Respondent failed to submit their Statement of Defense, so his identity and activities are not clear.

**(9) Response by Respondent:**

No Response.

**(10) Rejoinder by Complainant:**

Since the Respondent failed to submit their reply to the Complaint of Complainant, so Rejoinder was not required to be submitted by Complainant.

**(11) Submissions of Documents by Complainant:**

Complainant submitted Domain name complaint with pages 1 to 17 (words 4928) and annexure from Annexure-1 to Annexure-15 with 99 pages inclusive of power of attorney.

As per the INDRP Rules of Procedure, Clause 4(a) – *The (maximum) word limit shall be 5000 words for all pleadings individually (excluding annexure). Annexure shall*

*not be more than 100 pages in total. Parties shall observe this rule strictly subject to Arbitrator's discretion.*

The Complainant submitted pleadings of 4928 words and Annexures of total 99 pages, which are as per the above norms of the INDRP Rules.

## **THE CONTENTIONS OF COMPLAINANT**

- (12) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights:**

### **Submission by Complainant**

(a) The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's AMAZON Marks. Specifically, the Disputed Domain Name incorporates (i) the Complainant's registered trademark AMAZON in its entirety, (ii) the descriptive or generic terms "estore" and "logistic", and (iii) the ccTLDs ".in" which is shared with AMAZON.CO.IN. These elements do not sufficiently distinguish the Disputed Domain Name from the Complainant's AMAZON Marks for purposes of Policy 4(a).

(b) Moreover, since the Disputed Domain Name has only been registered since 2024, it is vastly subsequent to the Complainant's usage of and rights in the AMAZON Marks both globally as well as in India. The Complainant's rights in its AMAZON Marks and AMAZON-formative domain names have also been recognized and upheld in previous proceedings before NIXI (National Internet Exchange of India) under the INDRP. In 2017, the Learned Arbitrator, in its order directing transfer of the disputed domain to Amazon in Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Surya Pratap <amazonsales.co.in> (Case No. INDRP/835 - decided on January 17, 2017), observed that:

"The Arbitrator is convinced with the distinctive nature of and the Complainant's ownership in the mark AMAZON and its well-known status in India. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the mark AMAZON in entirety and merely adds a descriptive word 'SALES' therewith, which is insufficient to differentiate the Disputed Domain Name with the mark



AMAZON. The Disputed Domain Name is therefore held to be confusingly similar with the Complainant's mark AMAZON."

(c) NIXI has also recognized the Complainant's rights in its AMAZON brand, including its well-known and famous nature, in the following domain dispute matters:

- a. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Amazon Fire <amazonfire.co.in> (INDRP/1370 - June 16, 2021)
- b. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Lubomir Kosvanec <amazonprimevideo.in> (INDRP/1222)
- c. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Alex parker <amazonemi.in> (INDRP/1166)
- d. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Logistics <amazoncareer.in> (INDRP/939 - decided on February 1, 2018)
- e. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Amazon India <amazon-hr.in> (INDRP/906 - decided on September 20, 2017)
- f. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Logistics <amazonlogistic.in> (INDRP/893 - decided on July 24, 2017)
- g. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Ram Mohan Reddy Nallavelli <amazonregistry.in> (INDRP/888 - decided on June 6, 2017)
- h. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Amazon India <amazon-job.in> (INDRP/873 - decided on April 18, 2017)
- i. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Jack Worli <flashamazonsale.in> (INDRP/868 - decided on April 3, 2017)
- j. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Jack Worli <amazonsales.in> (INDRP/861 - decided on February 15, 2017)
- k. Amazon.com, Inc. and Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Shilei <amazonfirephone.in> INDRP/622 - decided on October 4, 2014)
- l. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Mr. Kislai Chaudhary <amazonstore.in> INDRP/361 - decided on June 12, 2012)
- m. Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Hari Kishore <amazonn.co.in> INDRP/348 - decided on May 4, 2012)

(d) Copies of a few of the above-mentioned orders are collectively enclosed as Annexure 13.



- (e) The Complainant's rights to the AMAZON Marks have further been upheld in several Forum arbitration proceedings (formerly the National Arbitration Forum or NAF - an approved Dispute Resolution service provider under ICANN domain name disputes) as well as by WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organization) in several cases - a list of which, together with copies of a few of the orders, is enclosed as Annexure 14.
- (f) It is indisputable that the Disputed Domain Name comprises of the Complainant's trade name and registered trademark AMAZON in its entirety. It was held in *Six Continent Hotels, Inc. v. The Omnicorp*, WIPO Case No. D2005-1249 that "the fact that a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant's registered mark is sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy") (quoting *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. Asd, Inc.com*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903). Similar lines of reasoning have been adopted in the following cases:
- a. *Britannia Building Society v. Britannia Fraud Prevention*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0505
  - b. *PepsiCo, Inc. v. PEPSI, SRL (a/k/a P.E.P.S.I.) and EMS Computer Industry (a/k/a EMS)* - WIPO Case No. D2003-0696;
  - c. *Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Andrei Kosko*, WIPO Case No. D2010-0762;
  - d. *Farouk Systems, Inc. v. QYM*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1572;
  - e. *Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd. v. Luttringer Alexander*, WIPO Case No. D2008-1979
- (g) The addition of the words 'estore' and 'logistic' as suffix to the Complainant's registered trademark AMAZON is incapable of lending the Disputed Domain Name any distinctiveness or reduce its similarity with the AMAZON Marks. In fact, both these words indicate provision of e-commerce and logistic services - which the Complainant has already been providing for a few decades now. Hence, use of the Disputed Domain Name will, in all likelihood, make internet users believe that the Respondent's impugned website belongs to the Complainant and the services provided on it originate from the Complainant as well - which is not the case. In this regard, it is relevant to mention that a mere search for

the words contained in the Disputed Domain Name, i.e. 'AMAZON ESTORE LOGISTICS', on the popular search engine Google.com leads to the Complainant's websites only. Extracts of the Google search in support of the above submission are enclosed as Annexure 15. This result establishes beyond doubt that the two concerned words - when used with 'AMAZON', are also associated with the Complainant alone. Therefore, the terms 'estore' and/or 'logistic' as suffix to the prior and registered trademark AMAZON are not sufficient to avoid confusion between the Disputed Domain Name and the AMAZON Marks.

**(13) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name:**

**Submission by Complainant**

- (a) Rights or legitimate interest in a domain name (in accordance with Policy 6 (a-c)) may be found where the registrant uses the domain name registration with a bonafide offering of goods or services; if the registrant has been commonly known by the domain name registration; or if the registrant is using the domain name registration in a legitimate, non-commercial manner, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or tarnish the trademark at issue. The Respondent in the present case has not fulfilled any of the afore-mentioned conditions for it to have demonstrable rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.
- (b) The Respondent is not making a bonafide offering of services under Policy 6(a) or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name registration under Policy 6(c). Upon information and belief, the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name for commercial purposes for its own financial gain. The landing page for the Disputed Domain Name is titled "Amazon Easy Store". However, the Respondent is not an Amazon Logistic Store Service Partner and has no authority to represent this program and therefore, its use of each of the Complainant's AMAZON Marks is without the Complainant's consent or authorization. Specifically, the landing page promotes bogus / fake "Amazon Estore," "Amazon Estore

logistics,” and “Amazon logistics store” franchises requiring payments to the Respondent. The Complainant does not offer Amazon Logistics-branded store or e-store programs. The Complainant has an Amazon Pay Smart Stores program, but the Respondent has nothing to do with it. Those seeking to apply for the purported franchises must fill out a registration form which displays the AMAZON Marks and solicits name, email, mobile phone, investment amount, and other information.



- (c) Even the footer of the impugned website states “Amazon Store | Powered By [Amazon]”.
- (d) The Respondent is using Complainant’s AMAZON Marks as its sole brand and identity. There are no disclaimers or other efforts to distinguish itself from the Complainant or to disclose the absence of a relationship between the two. Also, the purported name of the landing page “Amazon Easy Store” simply misappropriates the Complainant’s AMAZON Marks and neither establishes the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the domain nor that the Respondent is commonly known by this name for purposes of the Policy.
- (e) The foregoing is calculated and likely to mislead the public as to the source or confuse them that the Respondent has the Complainant’s approval. This constitutes passing off and is not a fair, nominative, or otherwise legitimate use. The Respondent benefits from Internet users who are

under the false belief that they have reached a site operated or endorsed by the Complainant. The presence of the word 'AMAZON' in the Disputed Domain Name, taken together with the associated activities, constitutes a calculated attempt to capitalize on confused or mistaken Internet users who use the Disputed Domain Name believing they are using a website legitimately operated or endorsed by the Complainant. The Respondent's efforts to falsely hold itself out and pass itself off online as the Complainant (or an entity or service endorsed by or affiliated with Complainant) does not amount to a bonafide offering of goods or services under Policy 6(a) and/or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name under Policy 6(c).

- (f) The Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or by AMAZON, AMAZON.COM, or any variations thereof. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way or licensed by the Complainant to use the AMAZON Marks. The Respondent is not an authorized partner of the Complainant's services. Hence, the Respondent is not making a legitimate / fair use of the Disputed Domain Name.
- (g) The Complainant has not approved, assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent the right to use its AMAZON Marks in connection with any domain name. The Respondent is well aware that the Complainant has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way directly or indirectly authorized the Respondent to register or make use of its AMAZON Marks, either as a domain name or in any other manner whatsoever. In fact, the Complainant, being concerned with the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name, had put the Respondent to notice. Therefore, a finding of the Respondent having no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name should necessarily follow.

**(14) The domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith:**

**Submission by Complainant**

- (a) The Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Since the impugned website being operated at the Disputed

Domain Name conspicuously displays a number of the Complainant's AMAZON Marks, it is clear that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with knowledge of the Complainant's rights and intended to create an association with the Complainant and its services.

- (b) The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 20, 2024, i.e. post 24 years of filing of trademark applications by the Complainant in India for registration of its mark AMAZON and nearly 20 years of the Complainant using its AMAZON Marks in commerce. This further clearly suggests actual knowledge and use of the Complainant and its AMAZON Marks by the Respondent at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Name. Thus, a finding of bad-faith registration of the Disputed Domain Name is irrefutable and must follow.
- (c) Furthermore, by using a domain name and trademarks same as / similar to the Complainant's and providing no other source identification, to promote alternative store, e-store, or delivery programs, the Respondent has created the false impression that its website or franchises / services originate with, are approved by, or are otherwise associated with the Complainant which potentially diverts and disrupts the Complainant's business. Furthermore, by promoting the Respondent's purported services using a domain name and trademarks same as / similar to the Complainant's, the Respondent has attempted to commercially benefit, unfairly and opportunistically, from the goodwill associated with the Complainant's marks, and this conduct of diversion shows bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy 4(c) and 7 (a)-(c).

#### **OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS:**

##### **(15) Submission of Complainant**

No other legal proceedings that have been commenced, are continuing or have been terminated by the Complainant in connection with or relating to the Disputed Domain Name.



**REMEDY SOUGHT:****(16) Submission of Complainant**

In light of the preceding, it is respectfully put forth that the Complainant has adequately satisfied the three conditions provided in Paragraph 4 of the INDRP. Therefore, the Complainant requests the arbitrator / panel appointed in these proceedings to issue the necessary directive for the Disputed Domain Name to be transferred to the Complainant.

**DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS:**

- (17)** After going through the correspondence, this AT comes to the conclusion that the Arbitral Tribunal was properly constituted and appointed as per Clause 5 of the INDRP Rules of Procedure and Respondent has been notified of the complaint of the Complainant.
- (18)** Respondent was directed to file the Soft copy (PDF & Editable) and the Hard copy of 'Reply of the said complete complaint (Statement of Defense)' on or before 09.12.2025. But Respondent failed to file the same by this time limit and even by 11.01.2026. Respondent has also not filed any application for the grant of extension of time for this submission. Since sufficient opportunity was given to Respondent to submit their pleading, therefore their right to submit the same was stand forfeited and no further opportunity shall be granted in this regard. The proceeding of this case was kept closed for award and the matter would be decided ex-parte on the basis of the documents on record with this tribunal as per INDRP policy.
- (19)** Under Clause 4, of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolutions policy (INDRP), the Complainant has filed a complaint to .IN Registry on the following premises:
- (a) the Registrant's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a Name, Trademark or Service Mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(b) the Registrant's has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the domain name; and

(c) The Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used either in bad faith or for illegal/unlawful purpose.

**(20) The Registrant's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a Name, Trademark or Service Mark in which the Complainant has rights:**

**Facts & Findings**

On the basis of the referred Awards of WIPO & INDRP cases, above mentioned facts by Complainant and non-submission of Statement of Defense, the Arbitral Tribunal concludes that the Complainant has established Clause 4(a) of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) and accordingly satisfies the said Clause of policy.

**(21) The Registrant's has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the domain name:**

**Facts & Findings**

On the basis of the referred Awards of WIPO & INDRP cases, above mentioned facts by Complainant and non-submission of Statement of Defense, the Arbitral Tribunal concludes that the Complainant has established Clause 4(b) of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) and accordingly satisfies the said Clause of policy.

**(22) The Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used either in bad faith or for illegal/unlawful purpose:**

**Facts & Findings**

On the basis of the referred Awards of WIPO & INDRP cases, above mentioned facts by Complainant and non-submission of Statement of Defense, the Arbitral Tribunal concludes that the Complainant has established Clause 4(c) of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) and accordingly satisfies the said Clause of policy.



(23) As per Clause 5(e) INDRP Rules of Procedure the Award of this case is published within the extended period of additional 30 days due to the non-availability of the stamp paper in the market.

(24) **ARBITRAL AWARD**

I, **Rajesh Bisaria**, Arbitrator, after examining and considering the pleadings and documentary evidence produced before and having applied mind and considering the facts, documents and other evidence with care, do hereby publish award in accordance with Clause 5, 17 and 18 of the INDRP Rules of Procedure and Clause 11 of .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), as follows:

***Arbitral Tribunal orders that the disputed domain name***

***“www.amazonestorelogistic.in”***

***be forthwith TRANSFERRED from Respondent to Complainant.***

***Further AT takes an adverse view on the bad faith registration of impugned domain by the Respondent and to restrict the act for future misuse, fine of Rs. 10000/- (Rs. Ten thousand only) is being imposed on the Respondent, as per the provision in clause 11 of .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) to be paid to .IN Registry for putting the administration unnecessary work.***

AT has made and signed this Award at Bhopal (India) on 13.02.2026 (Thirteenth Day of February, Two Thousand Twenty-Six).

**Place: Bhopal (India)**

**Date: 13.02.2026**



**(RAJESH BISARIA)**

**Arbitrator**