



सत्यमेव जयते

INDIA NON JUDICIAL

Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi

₹100

e-Stamp

Certificate No. : IN-DL85212787657013V
Certificate Issued Date : 03-Apr-2023 02:18 PM
Account Reference : SELFPRINT (PU)/ dl-self/ NEHRU/ DL-DLH
Unique Doc. Reference : SUBIN-DLDL-SELF41928251636527V
Purchased by : SANJEEV CHASWAL
Description of Document : Article 12 Award - Movable
Property Description : GRANT OF AWARD IN THE DOMAIN NAME WWW.BITMAININVEST.IN
Consideration Price (Rs.) : 0
(Zero)
First Party : SANJEEV CHASWAL
Second Party : NA
Stamp Duty Paid By : SANJEEV CHASWAL
Stamp Duty Amount(Rs.) : 100
(One Hundred only)

₹100



SELF PRINTED CERTIFICATE TO BE
VERIFIED BY THE RECIPIENT AT
WWW.SHCILESTAMP.COM

IN-DL85212787657013V

Please write or type below this line

IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION /
COMPLAINT OF BITMAIN INVEST. IN
CASE NO 1663 OF BITMAIN
TECHNOLOGIES LTD.

Statutory Alert:

1. The authenticity of this Stamp certificate should be verified at 'www.shcilestamp.com' or using e-Stamp Mobile App of Stock Holding. Any discrepancy in the details on this Certificate and as available on the website / Mobile App renders it invalid.

**INDRP ARBITRATION
UNDER THE NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA [NIXI]
ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL PROCEEDING
SOLE ARBITRATOR: SANJEEV KUMAR CHASWAL**

**In the matter of Arbitration Proceeding for the Domain name
<bitmaininvest.in>**

AND IN THE MATTER OF INDRP CASE NO: 1663

**Bitmain Technologies Limited
11/F, Wheelock House,
20 Pedder Street,
Central, Hong kong
Email: vivian.he@hankunlaw.com,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, Complainant**

Vs.

**Sjs Sjsj
466, Chandigarh
(91).7636134264E
mail: iamanand144@gmail.comRespondent**

\ ARBITRATION AWARD

Disputed Domain Name: <bitmaininvest.in>

WHEREAS I, have been appointed by NIXI as sole arbitrator pursuant to the complaint filed by the complainant Bitmain Technologies Limited having its office at 11/F, Wheelock House, 20 Pedder Street, Central, Hongkong China by invoking this administrative proceeding through its authorized signatory, in respect of domain name against the unknown Registrant / Respondent invoking domain arbitration proceedings against the unknown registrant as Respondent herein.



WHEREAS the Complainant has filed the above arbitral complaint against you for registering domain name <*bitmaininvest.in*> as Registrant / Respondent and seeking a claim of relief of transferring the said domain name to the Complainant herein.

WHEREAS the Registrant / Respondent has invoked redacted policy with its registrar, thereby registrar has concealed the address from public at large, as such the NIXI has provided the WHOIS records that contains the alphabets as name and concealed address details of the Registrant / Respondent to the sole arbitrator and the email address is being incorporated by the undersigned arbitrator for issuance of the notice in this domain complaint at first instance.

As such in the above said arbitral reference the sole arbitrator had issued the directions to the complainant for compliance of notice and the Registrant / Respondent to file reply, the complainant had served the notice to the respondent / registrant to their email address as listed in WHOIS records. The respondent / registrant was directed to submit reply, detail statement, if any, on or before **19th of March 2023** but the Registrant / Respondent has failed to submit its reply, or any detail statement in the above arbitral reference, even after receipt of notice to the arbitrator office,

That as respondent / registrant had failed to submit its reply or Statement to the sole arbitrator office, thus it was clearly proved that the respondent / registrant is not interested in pursuing the present arbitration proceedings thus on 24th of March 2023 the sole arbitrator had foreclosed the opportunity of filing of reply or statement granted to the respondent / registrant after grant of sufficient time and kept the matter *for* final orders on merits.

History

That NIXI have appointed the undersigned as sole arbitrator pursuant to the complaint filed by the complainant Bitmain Technologies Limited having its office at 11/F, Wheelock House, 20 Pedder Street, Central, Hong kong China invoking this administrative domain arbitration proceedings through its authorized signatory, in respect of domain name <*bitmaininvest.in*> against the Registrant / Respondent Sjs Sjsj 466, Chandigarh, (91).7636134264 Email:iamanand144@gmail.com



The Complainant in the proceedings is M/s. Bitmain Technologies Limited having its office at 11/F, Wheelock House, 20 Pedder Street, Central, Hong Kong China, the Complainant, has business operations in many countries across the globe, including India.

The Registrant / Respondent, who had registered domain name <**bitmaininvest.in**> through the IN. registry registrar GoDaddy.com, LLC, the office address and other details of the Registrant / Respondent were withheld by registrar by invoking “REDACTED FOR PRIVACY” on request as such its details were concealed from public domain, as such the Complainant did not have address information in relation to the Registrant / Respondent, therefore the complainant M/s. Bitmain Technologies Limited having its office at 11/F, Wheelock House, 20 Pedder Street, Central, Hong Kong China has filed the complaint invoking domain arbitration proceedings against the Registrant / Respondent for registering domain name illegally but as a matter of fact the case of the complainant is of a identity theft and thereby claiming a relief of transferring the registered domain name <**bitmaininvest.in**> from the Respondent / Registrant to the Complainant herein.

The NIXI has provided the WHOIS records in relation to Registrant to the sole arbitrator on its initial proceedings that contains the name address and other details of the Registrant / Respondent and the same were incorporated by the undersigned arbitrator for issuance of the notice in this domain complaint at first instance.

That after entering upon as sole arbitrator in the above said arbitral reference, on 4th of March 2023 the undersigned had issued the 1st notice by way of directions to the complainant and the Registrant / Respondent herein to comply issued directions as stated therein in the notice under time bound manner, as prescribed under the INDRP ARBITRATION rules and Procedures.

1. The Parties:

The Complainant in this arbitration proceeding is M/s. Bitmain Technologies Limited having its office at 11/F, Wheelock House, 20 Pedder Street, Central, Hong Kong China,, company incorporated under the laws of the Hong Kong China, has invoked this administrative domain arbitration proceedings against the Registrant / Respondent, in respect of domain name <**bitmaininvest.in**>



2. The Domain Name and Registrar:

2.1 The disputed domain name <*bitmaininvest.in*> is registered by the IN. registry, the registrar of Go Daddy has withheld address and concealed other details of the Registrant / Respondent "REDACTED FOR PRIVACY" as such address details of the Registrant / Respondent were not available in public domain, as such the Complainant did not have address information in relation to the Registrant / Respondent, therefore the complainant M/s. Bitmain Technologies has approached NIXI for availability of the address of the Registrant / respondent herein and Registrant / Respondent,

3. Arbitration Proceedings Procedural History:

3.1 This is a mandatory arbitration proceeding in accordance with the IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy [INDRP], adopted by the National Internet Exchange of India ["NIXI"]. The INDRP Rules of Procedure [the Rules] as approved by NIXI in accordance with the Indian Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. By registering the disputed domain name with the NIXI accredited Registrar, the Respondent agreed to there solution of the disputes pursuant to the IN Dispute Resolution Policy and Rules framed there under.

According to the information provided by the National Internet Exchange of India ["NIXI"], the history of this proceeding is as follows:

3.2 In accordance with the Rules, 2(a) and 4(a), NIXI formally notified the Respondent to the Complaint, and appointed the undersigned as the Sole Arbitrator for adjudicating upon the dispute in accordance with the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, and the Rules framed there under. IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy and the Rules framed there under.

The Arbitrator as submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence as required by the NIXI.



As per the information received from NIXI, the history of the proceedings is as follows:

- 3.3 The present Arbitral Proceedings have commenced on 4th of March 2023 by issuing of 1st notice under rule 5(c) of INDRP rules of procedure and the same was forwarded through email directly to the Respondent / Registrant as well as to complainant separately, directing the complainant to serve the copies of the domain complaint along with complete set of documents in soft copies as well as physically or via courier or post to the Respondent / Registrant at the address provided in the WHOIS details of the domain. The said notice was successfully served by the complainant to the Respondent / Registrant through email too.
- 3.4 Further as per the issued Notice to the Respondent / Registrant was directed to file their reply, detail statement, if any, to the above said complaint within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of this Notice or by 19th of March **2023**, failing which the Complaint shall be decided on the basis of the merits.
- 3.5 The respondent / registrant had failed to submit its reply, or detail statement in the above arbitral reference even after receipt of notice of 4th of March 2023 through email address as sent under rule 5(c) of INDRP Rules and procedure for submission reply, detail statement, if any, on or before 19th of March 2023,
- 3.6 The non filing of reply by the Registrant / Respondent, clearly proves that the respondent / registrant was not interested in pursuing the present arbitration proceedings, as such the sole arbitrator had on vide its order dated **24th of March 2023**, foreclosed the right of the respondent / registrant of filing of reply and proceeded with deciding of this domain dispute complaint <*bitmaininvest.in*> solely on merits.

4. Factual Background:

- 4.1 The Complainant in these administrative proceedings is M/s. Bitmain Technologies Limited having its office at 11/F, Wheelock House, 20 Pedder Street, Central, Hong Kong China by invoking this administrative domain arbitration proceeding through its authorized signatory, in respect of domain name <*bitmaininvest.in*> against the Registrant / Respondent



5 Parties Contentions:

- 5.1 The complainant has submitted many legal submissions under INDRP Rules of Procedure for seeking relief against the Registrant / respondent for registering domain name <**bitmaininvest.in**> illegally.
- 5.2 The complainants has submitted, the Registrant / Respondent had failed to submit its reply or detailed statement to the sole arbitrator panel within 15 days of the issued notice but hadalso hadfailed to comply directions of the said notice as well.
- 5.3 The complainant has raised three pertinent grounds under INDRP Rules of Procedure for seeking relief against the Registrant / respondent disputed domain name <**bitmaininvest.in**> is stated as under:

A. Complainant Grounds for proceedings

- I. The Complainant counsel states that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has statutory/common law rights.*
- II. The Complainant counsel states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.*
- III. That the disputed domain name has been registered or is/are being used in bad faith.*

The Complainant submits its detailed contentions in their complaint that are described in details as under:

- I. The Complainant counsel states that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has statutory/common law rights.*

The Complainant's Claim of Statutory Rights

- 5.4 The complainant is the owner of the BITMAIN trademarks is registered proprietor of the well-known trade mark BITMAIN.



- 5.5. The Complainant and its affiliates have been using marks including “Bitmain” and “**BITMAIN**” as their trade name in Mainland China, Hong Kong (China), Singapore, the United States, the European Union, Switzerland and other countries and regions.

Besides, the Complainant has registered a series of “**BITMAIN**” trademarks in the aforementioned countries or regions since 2015. Given that the Complainant holds a series of nationally or regionally registered trademarks or service marks, the Complainant has established a prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purpose of standing to file a INDRP case. (*see WIPO Overview 3.0; INDRP case No.1228, ByteDance Ltd. vs. Jing Ren*)

- 5.6 The Complainant company was incorporated on January 10, 2014 and has been in good standing so far. The Complainant and its affiliates (including but not limited to Beijing Bitmain Technology Limited Company) are leading global technology companies, offering products including chips, servers, and cloud solutions, which are mainly used in the areas of block chain (especially in the fields of bitcoin and mining machine) and artificial intelligence. The Complainant and its affiliates have places of business in China, Singapore, the United States, and other locations.

- 5.7 The Complainant and its affiliates enjoy prior trade name rights, prior trademark rights, prior domain name rights and other related rights in respect of the “Bitmain”, “**比特大陆**” and “**BITMAIN**” marks in various countries and regions worldwide. The Complainant and its affiliates have been using marks including “Bitmain” and “**BITMAIN**” as their trade name since 2013. They also hold registered trademarks for marks such as “**BITMAIN**” in Mainland China, Hong Kong (China), Singapore, the United States, the European Union, Switzerland, and other countries and regions. The domain name <bitmain.cn> held by the Complainant’s affiliate was registered as early as in 2013 and has been in continuous operation since then.

- 5.8 The Complainant and its “Bitmain” brands are well-known and influential all over the world in the fields of blockchain and artificial intelligence.



The Complainant and its affiliates have received multiple rounds of financing and have been listed on the Hurun Global Unicorn List 2019, the Hurun China 500 Most Valuable Private Companies 2019, the Hurun China Most Valuable Chip Design Private Companies 2020, the Global Silicon 100, the Shimao Strait-Hurun China 500 Most Valuable Private Companies 2020, the Suzhou High-tech District-Hurun Global Unicorn List 2020, and other lists of domestic and international honors. The Complainant's Antminer products are the industry-leading products holding a majority share of the global market and have been rated as top products by several domestic and foreign medium.

- 5.9 The disputed domain name <bitmaininvest.in> incorporates the Complainant's "Bitmain" mark in its entirety, with the descriptive word "invest" as a suffix. The alterations of the mark, made in forming the domain name, do not save it from the realm of confusing similarity. Precedents have shown that a domain name is identical to a trademark when the domain name contains or is confusingly similar to the trademark, regardless of the presence of other words in the domain name (*see INDRP Case No.861, Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Surya Pratap; INDRP Case No.868, Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Jack Worli*).
- 5.10 The main part of the disputed domain name <bitmaininvest.com> is "bitmaininvest" of which the "bitmain" part is identical to the Complainant and its affiliates' prior trade name and trademarks. Although the domain name in dispute has the word "invest" appended to "bitmain", merely a descriptive word does not have significant distinguishing features. Therefore, the domain name in dispute <bitmaininvest.com> cannot be effectively distinguished from the Complainant's trademark and further enhances confusion among the relevant public. In addition, the ccTLD extension ".in" does not preclude the possibility of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and its affiliates' prior trade name and trademarks. (*See INDRP Case No.1625, Britannia Industries Limited v. Amit Singh*)
- 5.11 In sum, the domain name in dispute is identical or extremely similar to a trademark or service mark owned by the Complainant and is extraordinary likely to confuse the relevant public.

I) Complainant's Claim of Statutory Rights:



- 5.12 The domain name in dispute was registered on October 25, 2022, which is much later than the time of the Complainant and its affiliates' earliest use and registration of the trademarks "Bitmain " and the domain name <bitmain.cn>; and

There is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to register or use any trade name, trademark, or domain name related to "Bitmain" or "**BITMAIN**". Due to the impeccable reputation of the Complainant around the world, the word "**BITMAIN**" is associated solely with the Complainant and no one else. Moreover, the Complainant's prior registered the domain "**BITMAIN**" which features extensive information about the products and services offered by the Complainant.

- 5.13 The Complainant and its affiliates have been using marks including "Bitmain" and "**BITMAIN**" as their trade name in Mainland China, Hong Kong (China), Singapore, the United States, the European Union, Switzerland and other countries and regions since 2013. Besides, the Complainant has registered a series of " " trademarks in the aforementioned countries or regions since 2015. Given that the Complainant holds a series of nationally of regionally registered trademarks or service marks, the Complainant has established *aprima facie* satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purpose of standing to file a INDRP case. (see WIPO Overview 3.0; INDRP case No.1228, ByteDance Ltd. vs. Jing Ren)

IV. That the disputed domain name has been registered or is/are being used in bad faith.

- 5.14. The domain name in dispute was registered on October 25, 2022, which is much later than the time of the Complainant and its affiliates' earliest use and registration of the trademarks "**BITMAIN**" and the domain name <bitmain.cn>; and there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to register or use any trade name, trademark, or domain name related to "Bitmain" or "**BITMAIN**". reasons justifying that the impugned domain name is being registered and/ or used in bad faith.


\



- 5.15 The Respondent acted in bad faith in registering the disputed domain name when it knows or shall know the Complainant's "Bitmain" and "**BITMAIN**" marks. The Respondent was aware of or at least should have been aware of the Complainant, its "Bitmain" and "**BITMAIN**" marks when the disputed Domain Name was registered.
- 5.16 Where there is a distinctive name and mark in which the Complainant has established considerable goodwill and reputation through using the name and mark online and offline for many years, it would be impossible to conceive that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name in good faith or without knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the mark.
- 5.17 As previously mentioned, the Complainant and its affiliates have prior trade name rights, prior trademark rights and prior domain rights in respect of the "Bitmain" and "**BITMAIN**" marks. Moreover, the Complainant's "Bitmain" and "**BITMAIN**" marks are not ordinary English words. Instead, they are highly original and distinctive made-up marks that have developed remarkable international reputation through the Complainant's long-term use. In this case, the disputed Domain Name was registered on October 25, 2022, much later than the date of registration .
- 5.18 Therefore, the Respondent should have full knowledge that the Complainant and its affiliates had prior rights and interests in the "Bitmain" and "**BITMAIN**" marks when registering the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent still chose to register the disputed Domain Name <bitmaininvest.in>, whose main body had incorporated the aforementioned marks. The registration of the disputed domain name itself had stopped the Complainant from registering it despite the Complainant's rights in the "Bitmain" and "**BITMAIN**" marks.
- 5.19 The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is likely to confuse the relevant public to believe that website directed to by the disputed domain name is the official website of the Complainant or its affiliates, which is a typical case of impersonating the Complainant's identity and intentionally misleading the relevant public to obtain improper commercial benefits, which constitutes malicious use.



- 5.20 The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name "**BITMAIN**" that incorporated a well-known trademark leads to the suspicion of the intentions of the Respondents. The internet traffic generated by the disputed domain name as a result of the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks and the prevention of the Complainant's use of its trademarks in corresponding domain name indicate bad faith use of the disputed domain name.
- 5.21 The Respondent has used the Domain Name misleadingly to attract Internet users to its website by creating a false impression of a connection between that website and the Complainant. Historical web pages of the disputed Domain Name captured by the webpage archiving site <archive.org> reveal the Respondent's further impersonation of the Complainant, that the disputed Domain Name used to be:
- a) using names and marks identical to the " " marks that the Complainant has prior rights to; and
 - b) proclaim as "Bitmain is World Digital Mining Summit 2022", "PoW Power and Mining Impetus With Cancun S19 XP Hyd", which is almost completely copied from the Blog on the <bitmain.com> website once registered under the name of the Complainant's affiliates; and
 - c) proclaim as "Bitmain Technologies Ltd. is a privately owned company headquartered in Beijing, China, that designs application-specific integrated circuit(ASIC) chips", the introduction of which obviously refers to the Complainant's affiliates; and
 - d) promoting and offering a forged and fake mobile App name "BITMAIN" which is suspiciously used for illegal activities such as fraudulent fundraising.
- 5.22 The disputed Domain Name is inaccessible currently, the non-use itself can constitute a threatened abuse hanging over the head of the Complainant
- 5.23 The Respondent still has full control over the disputed Domain Name and may put it into use at any time if FCA policy allows. The nature of the Domain Name and the Respondent's historical use of it suggest that the Respondent is threatening to use it in a way which is likely to confuse people or businesses into believing that the Domain Name is registered to, operated or authorized by, or otherwise connected with the Complainant.



- 5.24 The Complainant is the registered proprietor of the many marks world over having word per se “BITMAIN”. The Complainant submits that as the domain name is <bitmaininvest.in> is clearly identical/confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark in which the Complainant has exclusive rights and legitimate interest As a result of the continuous and extensive use of the Complainant’s trademark “BITMAIN” over a long period spanning a wide geographical area coupled with extensive advertising publicity, the said trademark enjoys an unparalleled reputation and goodwill
- 5.25 The disputed domain name is confusinglyand deceptively similar to the Complainant’s “BITMAIN” trademarks and its trade name, which have beenextensively and continually used in numerous countries including India for many years. The Respondent has registered the domain name which comprises, the significant part of the Complainant’s trademark “BITMAIN”.

In *M/s Satyam Infoway Ltd. vs. M/s Sifynet Solution (P) Ltd. JT. (2004 (5) SC 541)*, it was held that “Domain name has all characteristics of trademark. As such principles applicable to trademark are applicableto domain name also. In modern times domain name is accessible by all internet users and thus there is needto maintain it as an exclusive symbol.”

In *LEGO Juris A/S v. Robert Martin, INDRP/125 (2010)*: “It is well-recognized that incorporating atrademark in its entirety, particularly if the mark is an internationally well-known mark, is sufficient toestablish that the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered mark.”

In*Starbucks Corporation vs. Mohanraj, INDRP/118 (2009)*: “Domain name wholly incorporating acomplainant’s registered trademark may be sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity, despiteaddition of other words to such marks.”

In *FAIRMONT v. Zahir Khan, Palki Event Inc. [Case No. D2017-1124]*, the Panel observed that “theComplainant is well known in the electrical infrastructure and power generation industry”. Thus, it isinconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the globally well-known FAIRMONT.



Further in *FAIRMONT v. Ahmed El Shaweesh, DnArab.com* [Case No. **D2019-1796**], the Panel observed that “The extension “.com” is considered as a technical element and has consequently no distinguishing effect.” Likewise, in this scenario, the disputed domain “FAIRMONTgroup.co.in” not only consists of the Complainant’s

The Complaint also relies on **Aditya Birla Management Corporation v. Chinmay** INDRP/1197 wherein the tribunal observed that the Registrant is involved in cyber-squatting by registering domain name containing the well-known trade mark of the complainant and thereby gaining illegal benefits

II) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

5.26 The Complainant is the sole proprietor of the “BITMAIN” trademarks and provides products and services under the mark “**BITMAIN**” globally, including India. Consequently, the Complainant has garnered immense goodwill and reputation under the “BITMAIN” trademark and the same is distinctive to the Complainant. Moreover, the disputed domain name is confusingly identical to the “BITMAIN” trademarks in which the Complainant enjoys substantial reputation and goodwill.. Hence, the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest with respect to its use of the disputed domain name.

5.27 The Complainant further submits that any person or entity using the mark “BITMAIN” as a domain name that too with related keyword referring to its corporate name “BITMAIN” is bound to lead customers and users to infer that its product or service has an association or nexus with the Complainant and lead to confusion and deception. It is indeed extremely difficult to foresee any justifiable use that the Respondent may have with the disputed domain name. On the contrary, registering this domain name gives rise to the impression of an association with the Complainant, which is not based in fact. [*Daniel C. Marino, Jr. v. Video Images Productions, WIPO-D2000-0598*].



- 5.28 The Respondent / Registrant was never authorised by the Complainant to register the impugned domain name <**bitmaininvest.in**> hold the domain name or make use of its “BITMAIN” Trademark in any manner. The Domain Name registered by the Respondent / registrant is clearly intended to “pass off” and have a free ride on its reputation and goodwill..
- 5.29 The Respondent has merely squatted on the domain with an intention to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s global reputation and goodwill. Furthermore, the disputed domain name is deceptively and confusingly similar to the “BITMAIN” trademarks, in which the Complainant enjoys substantial reputation and goodwill. Thus, the Respondent clearly can have no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, which is nothing but a mere duplication of the Complainant’s prior, registered and well-recognized “BITMAIN” trademarks.
- 5.29 The Complainant is required to make a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the domain name at issue. When the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in a domain name, then total burden shifts to Respondent to rebut Complainant’s contentions. If Respondent fails to do so, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. In the present case, the Respondent cannot demonstrate or establish any rights or legitimate interest in the infringing domain name.
- 5.30 The Respondent seems to have intentionally registered the disputed domain name, which reproduces Complainant’s well-known trademark **VELCRO**, in order to capitalize / profit from the goodwill associated with the famous mark. *Similarly in the INDRP matter of Velcro Industries B.V. v. Velcro Technologies [INDRP/858; VelcroTechnologies.in]: “There is no showing that before any notice to the Registrant of the dispute, the Registrant’s 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. Rather, the website associated with the disputed domain name is not being used for any bonafide / legitimate purposes, but has been parked with the Domain Registrar, GoDaddy LLC only. It has been held that merely registering the domain name is not sufficient to establish rights or legitimate interests. [Vestel Elektronik Sanayiye Ticaret AS v. Mehmet Kahveci, WIPO-D2000-1244].*



5.31 The Respondent's act of registering the impugned domain www.bitmaininvest.in of which the Complainant's trade/service mark FAIRMONT forms a conspicuous part, is an infringement of the Complainant common law and statutory rights as it is vested in its registered and well-known mark "BITMAIN". There can be no plausible explanation for the use of the mark "~~BITMAIN~~" by the Respondent as the said trade service mark of the Complainant is a coined and invented term.

5.32 The Respondent using illegally the long and widespread reputation of the Complainant's trademarks, the compelling conclusion is that the Respondent, by choosing to register and use a domain name which is not only fully similar to the Complainant's widely known and distinctive trade mark but identical, intended to ride on the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark in an attempt to exploit, for commercial gain, Internet traffic destined for the Complainant. Potential partners and end users are led to believe that the website is either the Complainant's site, especially made up for the bearings, or the site of official authorized partners of the Complainant, while in fact it is neither of these [*Viacom International Inc., and MTV Networks Europe v. Web Master, WIPO- D2005-0321 – mtvbase.com*].

5.33 There can be no plausible explanation for the registration and use of the impugned domain name <bitmaininvest.in> by the Respondent as the trademark /service mark "BITMAIN" of the Complainant, which is exclusively used by the complainant, its group companies, subsidiaries. As previously stated.

Hence, it is likely that the Respondent was interested in obtaining the disputed domain name only because it is identical to a name in which the Complainant has rights and interest to extort the Complainant. Such use of a domain name does not provide a legitimate interest under the Policy.

In L'OREAL vs Jack Sun INDRP/343 (2012), the learned Arbitrator observed that although the disputed domain name belonged to the Respondent, the simple use of the L'OREAL trademark in the disputed name did not confer rights or legitimate interest to the Respondent in the same. Accordingly, and for all the reasons above, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name as per INDRP Policy, para 6 (ii); INDRP Rules, para 4 (b) (vi) (2).



III) The Respondent's disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

- 5.34 The circumstances detailed above indicate that the Registrant has registered or acquired the impugned domain name with dishonest intention to mislead and divert the consumers and to tarnish the well-known trademark/ corporate name/ domain name "BITMAIN" of the Complainant and former use of the infringing domain name as a parking page with PPC links for financial gain, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial fair use. The use is neither legitimate nor fair and does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users.
- 5.35 The Complainant states in his complaint that the Respondent's act of registering the impugned domain name incorporating: the trademark of the Complainant "BITMAIN" is a mala-fide attempt on the Respondent's part to squat over the impugned domain name and make illegal economic gains and profits by misusing and free-riding on the unprecedented goodwill and reputation associated with the registered and well- own trademark "BITMAIN" of the Complainant.
- 5.37 The Respondent knowingly chose to register and use the disputed domain name *<bitmaininvest.in>* to divert customers from the Complainants' official website and drawing damaging conclusions as to the Complainant's operations in India, thus adversely affecting the Complainant's goodwill and reputation and its right to use said India specific domain name. Doing so, it also violated Rule 3 clause (b) of INDRP, whereby a domain registrant declared that he would not infringe the intellectual property rights of others but, given the above facts, Respondent is thus guilty of wilful suppression, concealment and misrepresentation by providing inaccurate / incorrect information to the Registry as well.
- 5.38 The Complainant submits that the Respondent has deliberately acquired a confusingly similar name and domain name in which the Complainant has substantial interest being its registered trade/service mark. The Respondent was very well aware of the commercial value and its significance of the various domains owned by the complainant of which the word "BITMAIN".



In Google Inc. Sunil K. Support Solution AditiSawant, Support Solution Rohit Sharma/ Vineet Sharma Deep Sunil K, FA1501001599162 (National Arbitration Forum, February 19, 2015) the Panel held that *“Respondent’s use of the contested domain name is an attempt to capitalize on the likelihood that Internet users will be confused as to the possibility of Complainant’s association with the contested domain name and its website. Under Policy 4 (b) (iv), this stands as evidence of Respondent’s bad faith in the registration and use of the domain name.”*

In LEGO Juris A/S v. Martin, INDRP/125 (2008): *“Where a domain name is found to have been registered with an intention to attract Internet users by exploiting the fame of a well-known trademark, it constitutes bad faith registration.”*

In Google Inc. vs. Chen Zhaoyang, INDRP/23 (2007) the Panel held that *“The Respondent has taken deliberate steps to ensure to take benefit of identity and reputation of the Complainant. The Respondent also provided web services which were similar to those of the Complainant. All these factors indicated that the disputed domain name was registered and used by the Respondent in bad faith in respect of the general commercial activities.”*

Contention of the Complainant:

- 5.39 Firstly the Complainant submits that the Respondent has used the Complainant’s well-known trademark ‘BITMAIN’ as part of the impugned domain name **<bitmaininvest.in>** in which the Complainant has legitimate right under common law as well as under statutory rights. The said acts of the Respondent, therefore, amounting to an infringement of the complainant’s rights as are vested in the trade/service mark ‘BITMAIN’.
- 5.40 Secondly, the Respondent is well aware of the insurmountable reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trade and service mark “**BITMAIN**” which insures and continues to insure its legitimate right to Complainant only.
- 5.41 The Complainant has a long and well-established reputation in the Complainant’s mark. By registering the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark,



the Respondent has acted in bad faith by breaching its service agreement with the Registrar because the Respondent registered a domain name that infringes upon the Intellectual Property rights of another entity, which in the present scenario is the Complainant. [***Relevant Decisions: Ray Marks Co. LLC v. Rachel Ray Techniques Pvt. Ltd., INDRP/215 (July 9th 2011); Kenneth Cole Production Inc. v. ViswasInfomedia, INDRP/93 (April 10, 2009)***].

5.42 The registration of the disputed domain name bearing the registered as a trade/service mark of the complainant is nothing but an opportunistic bad faith registration on the part of the Respondent.

5.43 It is a settled law that registration of identical or confusingly similar domain name that is patently connected with a particular trademark owned by an entity with no connection with the trademark owner is indicative of bad faith as understood in the Policy. With regard to famous brands, successive UDRP panels have found Bad faith registration where:

a) ***Complainant's name was famous at the time of registration: Cho Yong Pil v. Sinwoo Yoon, WIPO-D2000-0310.***

b)Registration of a well-known trademark by a party with no connection to the owner of the trademark and no authorization and no legitimate purpose to utilize the mark reveals bad faith: America Online Inc. v. Chinese ICQ Network, WIPO-D2000-0808.

c) The very use of domain name by Respondent who had no connection whatsoever with Complainant's mark and product suggests opportunistic bad faith: America Online Inc. v. Chinese ICQ Network, WIPO-D2000-0808.

d)Thus, the Respondent is guilty of registering and using the disputed domain name <bitmaininvest.in> in bad faith in terms of Para 7 of the INDRP.

B. Contention of the Respondent:

5.44 The Respondent had not filed any response to the Complaint though they were given an opportunity to do so. Thus the Complaint had to be decided based on submissions on record and analyzing whether the Complainant has satisfied the conditions laid down in paragraph 4 of the policy.



6. Discussion and Findings:

- 6.1 It is evident that the Respondent knowingly chose to register and use the disputed domain name <**bitmaininvest.in**> to divert customers from the Complainants' official website and drawing damaging conclusions as to the Complainant's operations in India, thus adversely affecting the Complainant's goodwill and reputation and its right to use said India specific domain name. Doing so, it also violated Rule 3 clause (b) of INDRP, whereby a domain registrant declared that he would not infringe the intellectual property rights of others.
- 6.2 It is further clear the Respondent / registrant redacted private policy to conceal their identity. Hence, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name in terms of the Policy. Rather, the Respondent is trying to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation, giving a false impression that the Respondent has some authorisation or connection with the Complainant in terms of a direct nexus or affiliation but the same is not true.
- 6.3 Once a complainant makes a prima facie case showing that a respondent lacks rights to the domain name at issue, the respondent must come forward with the proof that it has some legitimate interest in the domain name to rebut this presumption.

[a] The Respondent's Default:

- 6.4 As per INDRP Rules of Procedure, it require as defined under Rule 8(b) that the arbitrator must ensure that each party is given a fair opportunity to present its case. The above Rule 8(b) be read as follows:
"In all cases, the Arbitrator shall ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case."
- 6.5 Further the Rule 11(a) of INDRP Rules of Procedure, as it empowers the arbitrator to move on with an ex parte decision in case any party, that does not comply with the time limits or fails to reply against the complaint.

The Rule 11(a) of INDRP Rules of Procedure as defined as under:



" In the event that a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances as determined by the Arbitrator in its sole discretion, does not comply with any of the time periods established by these Rules of Procedure or the Arbitrator, the Arbitrator shall proceed to decide the Complaint in accordance with law."

- 6.6 The Respondent was given notice of this administrative proceeding in accordance to above the Rules. The .IN Registry discharged its responsibility under Rules paragraph 2(a) to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent of the Complaint
- 6.7 As previously indicated; the Respondent had failed to file any reply to the Complaint and has not sought to answer nor presented its assertions, evidence or contentions in any manner against complaint. The undersigned as being arbitrator opined that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present his case, thus non submission of the reply by the Respondent to the Arbitrator, entail the sole arbitrator to proceed on the Complaint in accordance to its merit.
- 6.8 The Rules paragraph 12(a) provides that the Arbitrator shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the INDRP and any law that the Arbitrator deems fit to be applicable. In accordance with the Rules paragraph as per 12, the Arbitrator may draw such inferences as are appropriate from the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's assertions and evidence or to otherwise contest the Complaint. In the circumstances, the Arbitrator's decision is based upon the Complainant's assertions and evidence and inferences drawn from the Respondent's failure to reply.

[b] The issues involved in the dispute:

=As per the complaint herein, the Complainant in its complaint has invoked paragraph 4 of the INDRP which read as under:

"Brief of Disputes:

Any Person who considers that a registered domain name conflicts with his legitimate rights or interests may file a Complaint to the .IN Registry on the following premises:



(i) the Respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name, trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

(iii) the Respondent's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

6.9 The Respondent / registrant is required to submit to a mandatory Arbitration proceeding in the event of a Complainant filed by a complaint to the .IN Registry, in compliance with this Policy and Rules thereunder."

6.10 According to paragraph 4 of the INDRP, there are 3 essential elements of a domain name dispute which are being discussed hereunder in the light of the facts and circumstances of this case.

I. =The Respondent's domain name is identical and confusingly similar to a name, trademark or service in which the Complainant has rights.

6.11 The mark "BITMAIN" has been highly known in both the electronic and print media; both in India and globally. According to the INDRP paragraph 3, it is the responsibility of the Respondent to find out before registration that the domain name he is going to register does not violate the rights of any proprietor/brand owner.

Paragraph 3 of the INDRP is reproduced below:

"The Respondent's Representations:

By applying to register a domain name, or by asking a Registrar to maintain or renew a domain name registration, the Respondent represents and warrants that: the statements that the Respondent made in the Respondent's Application Form for Registration of Domain Name are complete and accurate; to the Respondent's knowledge, the registration of the domain name will not infringe upon or otherwise violate the rights of any third party; the Respondent is not registering the domain name for an unlawful purpose; and the Respondent will not knowingly use the domain name in violation of any applicable laws or regulations.



It is the Respondent's responsibility to determine whether the Respondent's domain name registration infringes or violates someone else's rights."

- 6.12 The Respondent / Registrant has failed in his responsibility discussed above and in the light of the pleadings and documents filed by the Complainant, the undersigned has come to the conclusion that the domain name <**bitmaininvest.in**> is identity theft, identical with or deceptively similar to the Complainants' "BITMAIN" mark. Accordingly, the undersigned conclude that the Complainant has satisfied the first element required by Paragraph 4 of the INDRP.

II. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name

- 6.13 The second element that the Complainant needs to prove and as is required by paragraph 4(ii) of the INDRP is that the Respondent has no legitimate right or interests in the disputed domain name.
- 6.14 Moreover, the burden of proof is on a Complainant regarding this element in the domain name lies most directly within the Respondent's knowledge and once the Complainant makes a prima facie case showing that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the domain name, the evidentiary burden shifts to the Respondent to rebut the contention by providing evidence of its rights in the domain name.
- 6.15 The Respondent has failed to submit reply thus not rebutted the contentions of the Complainant and has not produced any documents or submissions to establish his interest in protecting his own right and interest in the domain name.

Further, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not made any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Thus, it is very much clear that the Respondent has no legitimate right or interest in respect of the disputed domain name <**bitmaininvest.in**>

For these reasons, the Arbitrator opines that the Respondent / Registrant have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.



The disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

6.16 It has been contended by the Complainant that the Respondent / Registrant has registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith and rather done a identity theft on their back. The language of the INDRP paragraph 4(iii) is clear enough, and requires that either bad faith registration or bad faith use be proved.

6.17 The paragraph 6 of the INDRP Rules provides that the following circumstances are deemed to be evidence that a Respondent / Registrant has registered and used a domain name in bad faith: *"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 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 by using the domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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 its Website or location or of a product or service on its Website or location."

6.18 From the circumstances of the case and the evidences placed before me by the Complainant herein, I am of the opinion that the Respondent / Registrant had no previous connection with the disputed domain name and It has clearly registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the Complainant, who is the owner of the said trademark from reflecting the said trademark in a corresponding domain name, It is clear case identity theft.

6.19 Moreover, use of similar disputed domain name by the Respondent / Registrant would result in confusion and deception of the trade, consumers and public, who would assume a connection or association between



the Complainant as disputed domain name <*bitmaininvest.in*> ,is associated exclusively with the complainant, by the trade and public in India and all over the world.

- 6.20 Further the Respondent / Registrant has prevented the Complainant, who is the owner of the service mark “BITMAIN” from reflecting in the domain name and also that the domain name is deceptively similar to the trademark of the Complainant and will lead to confusion with the Complainant's mark “BITMAIN”. Moreover, the Respondent / Registrant have redacted private policy to conceal its actual identity details and have not been replying to the communications sent by the complainant.

Thus, all the three conditions given in paragraph 6 of the Rules are proved in the circumstances of this case and thus the registration of the impugned domain name of the Respondent is a registered in bad faith.

7. DECISION

- 7.1 The Respondent / Registrant has failed to comply with Para 3 of the INDRP which requires that it is the responsibility of the Respondent / Registrant to ensure before the registration of the impugned domain name by the Respondent that the domain name registration does not infringe or violate someone else's rights other than the complainant herein
- 7.2 The Complainant has given sufficient evidence to prove trademark rights on the disputed domain name. Further; the Respondent's registration of the domain name is dishonest and malafide.

The Respondent / Registrant have clearly registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the Complainant who is the owner of the said trademark from reflecting the said trademark in a corresponding domain name.

- 7.3 The Respondent / Registrant have not given any reason to register the domain name rightfully owned by the Complainant and therefore it can be presumed that the Respondent / Registrant had registered the domain name only to make monetary benefit by selling the domain name to the rightful owner or his competitor.



[Relevant WIPO decisions:

Uniroyal Engineered Products, Inc. v. Nauga Network Services D2000-0503; Thaigem Global Marketing Limited v. SanchaiAree D2002-0358; Consorzio del FormaggioParmigianoReggiano v. La casa del Latte di Bibulic Adriano D2003-06611

- 7.4 It is a settled proposition that the registration of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark has been upheld to be in bad faith and this contention upheld by numerous INDRP as well as UDRP decision. Some notable cases reaffirming this proposition are INDRP decision in *Trivago N.V. is. Shiv Singh (INDRP/1 171)* and *WIPO decisions in Marie Claire Album v. Mari Claire Apparel, Inc., Case No D 2003 0767* another case *Verve ClicquotPonsardin, MaisonFortdée en 1772 v. The Polygenix group Co case Adidas D 2000 0163* and *Adidas-Solomon AG v. Domain Locations Case No D 2003 04*
- 7.5 While the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, The panels have recognized that this could result in the often impossible task of proving a negative, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge of the Respondent.

Therefore a complainant is required to make out a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such *prima facie* case is made, Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name.

Thus it is very much clear that the Respondent / Registrant is using the disputed domain name in bad faith and 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.

[Relevant WIPO decisions: Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd. D2003-0455; Belupod.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o. D2004-01101

- 7.6 The Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name is abusive and in bad faith. The Respondent / Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name. In my view, the Complainant has satisfied all the three requisite conditions laid down in paragraph 4 of the INDRP policy.



- 7.7 It has also well-settled and has been held by various Panels deciding under UDRP and INDRP that where the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's registered trademark, the same is sufficient to establish the first element.

FAIRMONT Sons Ltd v. mmt admin / OkFAIRMONTbyebye.com (WIPO Decision Case No. D2009-0646), F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Jason Barnes, ecnopt, WIPO Case No. D2015-1305, Swarovski Aktiengesellschaft v. meixudong, WIPO Case No. D2013-0150, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Domains by Proxy, LLC / UFCW International Union, WIPO Case No. D2013-1304

- 7.8 The prior decision of a Panel in ***M/s Retail Royalty Company v. Mr. Folk Brook INDRP/705*** wherein on the basis of the Complainant's registered trademark and domain names for "AMERICAN EAGLE", having been created by the Complainant much prior to the date of creation of the disputed domain name <americaneagle.co.in> by the Respondent, it was held that

"The disputed domain name is very much similar to the name and trademark of the Complainant. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has recently held that the domain name has become the business identifier.

A domain name helps identify the subject of trade or service that entity seeks to provide to its potential customers. Further that there is strong likelihood confusion that a web browser looking for AMERICAN EAGLE products in India or elsewhere would mistake the disputed domain name as of the Complainant. "

- 7.9 It was observed that ***"it is the Registrant's responsibility to determine whether the Registrant's domain name registration infringes or violates someone else's rights"*** and since the Respondent failed to discharge such responsibility, it was held that the Complainant has satisfied the first element required by Paragraph 4 of the INDRP.

In the present dispute as well, the Respondent, in registering the disputed domain name, has done so in clear violation of the exclusive rights of the Complainant in the FAIRMONT name and mark. ***In Lockheed Martin Corporation v. Aslam Nadia (INDRP/947)***



The WIPO Administrative Panel in *VeuveClicquotPonsardin, MaisonFondee en 1772 vs. The Polygenix Group Co., WIPO Case No.D2000-0163* has been held that registration of a domain name so obviously connected with a well-known product that its very use by someone with no connection with the product suggests opportunistic bad faith. The Respondent is also guilty of the same.

- 7.10 The Registrant / Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name is abusive and in bad faith. The Registrant / Respondent have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

In my considered view, the Complainant has satisfied all the three requisite conditions laid down in paragraph 4 of the INDRP policy.

In accordance to the INDRP defined Policy and Rules, the sole arbitrator directs that the disputed domain name <*bitmaininvest.in*> be transferred from the Registrant / Respondent to the Complainant herein with a request to NIXI to monitor the transfer of domain name in time bound manner.



**SANJEEV KUMAR CHASWAL
SOLE ARBITRATOR
INDRP ARBITRATION NIXI**

NEW DELHI DATE 2nd of April 2023