



தமிழ்நாடு தமில்நாடு TAMILNADU 09/12/25
SHIRIJA.M
12th December 2025
COMPLAINT INDRP Case No. 2030

ES 723376
திருமதி. N. புவனேஸ்வரி
முத்திரைத்தாள் விற்பனையாளர்
1/613-D, 16வது வீதி, பாலமுருகன் நகர்.
சோழவரம், திருவள்ளூர்-600 067
உரிமம் எண்: 1057-3/ஆ7/2021

IN THE MATTER OF AN
ARBITRATION FOR A DISPUTE
RELATING TO THE DOMAIN
NAME www.colgate.in UNDER THE
.IN DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE
RESOLUTION POLICY

1. Colgate-Palmolive Company
300 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022,
USA
2. Colgate-Palmolive (India) Ltd.

M. Shirija
M.SHIRIJA B.SC., M.L.
STS Law Associates
2/689A, River View Enclave, First Main Road,
Manapakkam, Chennai - 600 125.

Colgate Research Centre

Main Street, Hiranandani Gardens

Powai, Mumbai – 400 076

1q

...Complainant

Versus

SAMVAD GROUP

A-73, NRI City

SEC-Omega-II

Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh -201310

.... Respondent

AWARD PASSED UNDER THE INDRP RULES OF PROCEDURE

AND THE ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION ACT, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	PARTIES TO THE ARBITRATION	3
2	APPLICABLE LAW AND JURISDICTION	3
3	FILING OF THE COMPLAINT AND CONSTITUTION OF THE ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL	3
4	THE DOMAIN NAME REGISTRAR AND REGISTRANT	4
5	PROCEDURAL HISTORY	5
6	COMPLAINANT'S CONTENTIONS	5
7	DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS	8
8	DISPOSITIONS	16

I. PARTIES TO THE ARBITRATION

1. The Complainant is The Complainant No. 1 in the instant proceeding is Colgate-Palmolive Company located at 300 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10022, USA. The Complainant No. 2 in the instant proceeding is Colgate-Palmolive (India) Ltd. located at Colgate Research Centre, Main Street, Hiranandani Gardens, Powai, Mumbai – 400 076 India represented by their Power of Attorneys Pravin Anand, Saif Khan, Achuthan Sreekumar, Rohil Bansal, Swastik Bisarya, Anand & Anand at First Channel Building, Plot No. 17A, Sector 16A, Film City, Noida, Uttar Pradesh – 201301,

2. The Respondent is SAMVAD GROUP A-73, NRI City, SEC-Omega-II, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh. Email : info@samvad.com

II. APPLICABLE LAW AND JURISDICTION

The .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy

The present arbitration proceeding is under and in accordance with the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Policy) which was adopted by the National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI) and sets out the legal framework for resolution of disputes between a domain name registrant and a Complainant arising out of the registration and use of an .IN Domain Name. By registering the domain name 'www.colgate.in' with the NIXI accredited Registrar, the Respondent has agreed to the resolution of disputes under the .IN Dispute Resolution Policy and Rules framed thereunder. The Policy and the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Rules of Procedure posted 2020 (the Rules) were approved by NIXI in accordance with the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

III. Filing of the Complaint and Constitution of the Arbitral Tribunal

1. The Complainant filed the Complaint under the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy against the Respondents, seeking transfer of the Domain

Name www.COLGATEcoin.in to the Complainant, following which, the .IN Registry sought the consent of **Tmt. M. SHIRIJHA** (the undersigned), who is a listed .IN Dispute Resolution Arbitrator under 5 (a) of the Rules, to act as Arbitrator in the said matter.

2. On 4th September 2025, the Arbitral Tribunal consisting of the said **Tmt.M. SHIRIJHA** as Sole Arbitrator was constituted under 5(b) of the Rules in respect of the Complaint filed by the Complainant herein.

3. On the very next day i.e. on 5th September 2025, the learned Arbitrator directed the Complainant to file the Authorisation document for filing the Complaint on behalf of the 2nd Complainant which was complied with and on perusal of the documents filed, As neither Vakalath nor Power of Attorney authorizing the Representative of the Complainant to file the Complaint is not filed, The learned Arbitrator directed them to file the same which was complied on 23rd October 2025 by filing Vakalath by Thiru SAIFKHAN & Thiru PRAJWAL KHUSWAHA Of M/s. Anand And Anand, 102, Lawyers Chambers, Delhi High Court, New Delhi (Tel: 0120-4059300 with E-mail: email1@anandandanand.com), on 23rd October 2025, and hence on 30th October 2025, the Arbitral Tribunal issued the Notice of Arbitration under 5(c) of the Rules. to the parties for commencement of Arbitral Proceedings.

4. The Arbitral Tribunal has been constituted properly and in accordance with the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996, the INDRP Policy and the Rules as amended from time to time. No party has objected to the constitution and jurisdiction of the Arbitral Tribunal and to the arbitrability of the dispute.

IV. THE DOMAIN NAME, REGISTRAR & REGISTRANT

The particulars of the registration of the domain name 'www.COLGATEcoin.in' as found in the .IN Registry database are set out below: GoDaddy having email IDs reg_admin@godaddy.com; india_grievanceofficer@godaddy.com; court disputes@godaddy.com; support@in.godaddy.com; entitymgmt@godaddy.com; legal@godaddy.com



M.SHIRIJHA B.SC., M.L.
STS Law Associates
2/669A, River View Enclave, First Main Road,
Manapakkam, Chennai - 600 125. |



V. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. The Sole Arbitrator, Tmt. M.Shirijha was appointed On 4th September 2025 for the INDRP case no. 2030 regarding the present Complaint filed under the INDRP.
2. Immediately thereafter, on Complainant filing necessary documents, on 30th October 2025, the Arbitral Tribunal issued the Notice of Arbitration under 5(c) of the Rules, to the parties for commencement of Arbitral Proceedings and directed the Complainant to serve the said Notice to the Respondent both Online and Offline to the address mentioned therein. The Respondent was given an opportunity to file a response in writing in opposition to the Complaint, if any along with evidence in support of its stand or contention on or before seven working days from the date of receipt of the said Notice.
3. As there was no response from the Complainant side regarding the compliance of the Order issued on 30th October 2025, The Learned Arbitrator on 3rd December 2025, directed them to file a compliance report of the same for which they responded on 10th December 2025, submitting the proof of delivery made to the Respondent both offline and online. Accordingly, on 3rd December 2025, This Arbitral Tribunal holds that the service on the Respondent was done in accordance with Rule 2(a) of the Rules. Further as the respondent has received the notice via email, quite a long time ago, and has chosen not to either appear before this Tribunal nor file any objections if any, inspite of the sufficient time granted, he was set exparte.

VI. COMPLAINANT'S CONTENTIONS

1. The Complainant No.1 is a company incorporated according to the laws of the State of Delaware, United States of America while The Complainant No. 2 is a public limited company incorporated in the year 1937 in India both carrying on the business inter alia of manufacturing and/or dealing in oral care products. The Complainant No. 1 is the proprietor of the trademark COLGATE, which has become a household oral care brand in India as well as globally and is easily recognizable by one and all in get-up and trade dress which are long established. The Complainant No. 1

uses its Intellectual Property in India entirely through the Complainant No. 2. COLGATE products enjoy tremendous reputation and goodwill throughout India as well as globally. This is primarily because the Complainants make huge investments in ensuring quality products along with building and promoting their brand name and deliberately maintaining consistency in the advertising and packaging of their products. This has been the Complainants' normal policy over the many decades of their existence in the markets world over and in India. Therefore, the Complainants' products and their distinctive packaging form an essential part of the vast fund of valuable goodwill that has undoubtedly accrued to the Complainants. Therefore, the Complainants have made a huge investment, cumulatively down the years, in their product. The Complainants have repeatedly been acknowledged and appreciated worldwide for the superior quality of their oral care products and have accumulated immense brand recognition in said products. The Complainants have received several laurels for these products, making them global leaders in oral care products and some of the awards received by the Complainants in India the Complainants have spent a lot of time, effort and money on advertising and promotion of their products. The advertisements pertaining to the Complainants' products are regularly and prominently featured in various regional Indian newspapers. One of the Complainants' most important and popular products is the COLGATE tooth paste and powder, especially amongst the rural sections of the society where the use of toothpowder for oral care and hygiene is a popular choice. The COLGATE tooth powder has been marketed in since 1951.

2. Since its inception, the Complainants have been continuously and consistently using the trademark and trade name COLGATE, possessing the distinctiveness of an invented word, for its own business activities and those of companies promoted by it. On account of its highly distinctive nature and pioneering activities, the trademark COLGATE acquired an excellent reputation from the very beginning and down the decades, the said trademark has consistently been associated with the Complainants who are known for the high quality of products manufactured and or services rendered

under the trademark COLGATE. The Complainants are the proprietors of the well-known trademark COLGATE by virtue of priority in adoption, long, continuous and extensive use and advertising, and the reputation consequently accruing thereto in the course of trade. The Complainants have exclusively used COLGATE as a trademark so that it is uniformly perceived as indicative of the source of the products i.e. the products of the Complainants. In fact, the first trademark registration for the mark COLGATE in India dated 30th September 1943. In addition to the common law rights that have accrued to the Complainants by virtue of the aforesaid facts, they are also the registered proprietors of several COLGATE-formative trademarks in India in relation to various goods across various classes. By virtue of the said registrations, the Complainants have the exclusive right to use the trademark COLGATE in relation to the goods covered thereunder and to obtain relief in respect of the infringement of the registered trademarks. Also, it has time and again been held by Indian Courts that domain names act as source identifiers and unauthorised use of well-known and registered brands / trademarks as part of domains also amount to infringement and passing off. The Complainants also own trademark registrations for the mark COLGATE in various countries besides India including the United States of America.

3. The Complainant being the proprietor of the well-known trademark COLGATE holds exclusive rights in the said trademark and is entitled to take action against unauthorized use thereof by third parties for any goods or services or in any other manner. The Complainants have also filed various cases in India to protect the mark COLGATE from misuse by third parties. As a result of the continuous and extensive use of the Complainants' trademark COLGATE over a long period of time spanning a wide geographical area coupled with extensive promotion and publicity, the said trademark enjoys an unparalleled reputation and goodwill and has acquired the status of a "well-known" trademark. It is submitted that a reputed and well-known trademark is one that embodies an aura of pre-eminent excellence and is recognized irrespective of the class of goods or services for which it is used and the Complainants' trademark COLGATE wholly qualifies for this distinction. The well-known trademark

COLGATE has consistently been associated with and exclusively denotes the Complainants, which companies are known for high quality of products manufactured under trademark COLGATE. The Complainants are also extremely active on social networking websites

4. The Respondent has registered the domain www.colgate.in thereby misappropriating illegally and without authority the trademark COLGATE, which is the exclusive property of the Complainants. The domain www.colgate.in was previously in the control of an individual called Zhaxia. The Complainants filed a Complaint before the NIXI against Zhaxia and the NIXI passed an order dated 26th May 2017 directing the domain www.colgate.in to be transferred to the Complainants and Thereafter, do to certain technical difficulties, the Complainants could not timely renew the domain www.colgate.in and the current Registrant took advantage of this and registered the domain in its name. The Registrant is a domain squatter and is not making any legitimate commercial use of the domain www.colgate.in which can be seen from the fact that the domain does not resolve into any fully functional website and it only hosts a one pager. hence this Complaint.

VII. DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS:

The Hon'ble Apex Court of India has repeatedly held that even in an uncontested matter the Plaintiff's case must stand on its own legs and it cannot derive any advantage by the absence of the defendants. Accordingly, A Complainant who alleges that the disputed domain name conflicts with its legitimate rights or interests must establish the following three elements required by Paragraph 4 of the INDRP Policy namely:

- a) The Respondent's domain name is identical and confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.
- b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name
- c) The Respondent's domain name has been registered or is being used in

bad faith.

Accordingly, the Arbitral Tribunal shall deal with each of the elements as under:

a) Whether the Respondent domain name is identical and/or deceptively similar to domain name and trademarks of the Complainant?

i) The copy of the trademark registration certificate of Trademark 'COLGATE' and WHOIS records shows Complainant is the owner of the same in India. Further The Extensive Annexures shows that The Complainant owns numerous trade mark registrations for 'COLGATE' in various jurisdictions and because of the extensive use and promotion of the 'COLGATE' trademark, the brand has gained recognition.

ii) The Complainant provided evidence with the Annexures, to establish that the Disputed Domain name www.colgate.in is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered and distinctive trademark. They claim that they have overwhelming common law as well as statutory rights in its trademark COLGATE and hence are the sole legitimate owners of the trade mark COLGATE. They plead that the disputed domain name <www.colgate.in> attempts to associate itself with the Complainants' online service under the trademark/domain name www.colgate.com, www.colgatepalmolive.co.in and www.colgate.co.in by incorporating the Complainants' mark COLGATE in its entirety. The malicious intention of the Respondent is evident from the blatant misappropriation of the Complainants' trademark COLGATE as the use of the word COLGATE would be understood as a reference to the Complainants because it is a registered and well-known trademark. In support of their contention, they relied upon a decision in *Magnum Piering Inc v. The Mudjackers*; WIPO Case No. D2000-1525, wherein it was held that *'Incorporation of a trademark in entirety in a domain name is sufficient in establishing confusing similarity'*

iii) The Complainant would argue that The Internet user or the unwary general public who do not know that the Complainants and the Respondent have no affiliation with each other or that the Complainants have not licensed or authorized or endorsed the use of their famous and well-known mark COLGATE will thus confuse the

Respondent's activities as those authorized or endorsed or affiliated with the Complainants which would lead to the dilution of the Complainants' well-known and famous trademark COLGATE. The Complainants further submit that a reputed and a well-known trademark is one that embodies an aura of pre-eminent excellence and is recognized irrespective of the class of goods or services for which it is used and the Complainants' trademark COLGATE wholly qualifies for this distinction and Hence the Respondent's domain name is identical and confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainants have rights.

iv) The contentions of the Complainant seems to be convincing. Moreover, The Arbitral Tribunal took notice of the decision in *Fendi Sr.I. v. Ndiaye Therese, WIPO Case No. D2018-0179*; *Birdies, Inc. v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC/Fu Li, WIPO Case No. D2019- 2134*, which through a catena of Orders passed by this Panel and WIPO (under the UDRP), states that domain extensions such as ".com" and ".in" are to be ignored while assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusing similar to a trade mark, the disputed domain name is regarded confusingly similar to that mark for the purposes of UDRP standing. The Arbitral Tribunal also took note of the decisions of *"It is well established under the .IN Policy that the ccTLD ".IN" may be disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's trade mark (AB Electrolux v. GaoGou of YERECT, INDRP/630 (<zanussi.in>))* and hence holds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark. *Nike Inc. v. Nike Innovative CV Zhaxia, INDRP Case No. 804*; *Metropolitan Trading Company v. Chandan Chandan, INDRP Case No. 811*; *Lego Juris A/s v. Robert Martin, INDRP Case No. 125*, wherein it was held that if a disputed domain name completely incorporates the trademark of the Complainant, then the mere addition of domain codes such as ".in" and/or ".co.in" will not distinguish the Respondent's disputed domain name. They contend that In several UDRP decisions as well, various panels have found that the fact that a domain name wholly incorporates a Complainant's registered trademark is sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity for the purpose of the Policy.

v) Following the said dicta referred above, and upon the facts and circumstances of the present case and the evidence placed before it, The Tribunal finds that the subject domain name <www.colgate.in. is not only identical but deceptively similar to the trademark 'COLGATECOIN' of the Complainant. Accordingly, the Arbitral Tribunal holds that the requirement of the first element in the INDRP Policy Paragraph 4(a) is satisfied.

b) Whether the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name?

i) To pass muster under Paragraph 4(b) of the INDRP Policy, the Complainant has to show that the Respondent has no rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under Paragraph 6 of the Policy.

ii) The Complainant asserts that The Respondent has no legitimate rights or interests in the impugned domain name and there is every likelihood that potential or unwary persons in the future could be misled into using the services of the Respondent under the impression that the same are being offered by the Complainants. The Complainants submit that the impugned domain www.colgate.in was registered by the Respondent despite having no nexus, affiliation or endorsement by the Complainants and neither being licensed by the Complainants to register the same. They further submit that there is every possibility that the Respondent may be engaged in illegal activities defrauding the public at large. If the Respondent succeeds, it will amount to unjust enrichment of the Respondent at the Complainants' expense. They plead that In order to prevent cyber squatting or trafficking or trading in domain names or marks, trademark law has been stretched to cover the Internet and domain names should be protected just like trademarks and in this connection, Reliance is placed on the Judgment of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court dated 4.7.2011 in *Arun Jaitley v. Network Solutions Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.; CS(OS) 1745/2009.* They plead that there could be no plausible explanation for the use of the domain name www.colgate.in by the Respondent since the Complainants' trademark COLGATE is exclusively used by the

Complainants.

iii) A careful perusal of the above shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or the name 'www.colgate.in' and nor does the Respondent operate a legitimate business or other organisation under the 'COLGATE' Domain name. As seen from the Annexures filed by the Complainant, The domain www.colgate.in was previously in the control of an individual called Zhaxia and after the Complaint made by this Complainant before the NIXI against Zhaxia an order dated 26th May 2017 was passed directing the domain www.colgate.in to be transferred to the Complainants. Later as the Complainants did not timely renew the domain www.colgate.in the current Registrant has registered the domain in its name. As argued by the Complainant, the domain does not resolve into any fully functional website and it only hosts a one pager and additionally, the said 'COLGATE' trademark was registered years before the disputed domain name was registered and hence the Complainant's contention that the Respondent domain name certainly impersonates the Complainant's, seems to be convincing and acceptable.

iv) When a Complainant makes out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name and If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have proved their case. In the case in hand, the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights and legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name www.colgate.in as Complainant has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or otherwise authorised Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or the 'COLGATE' Trademark and the same is also not used for making legitimate non-commercial use. But the Respondent has failed to appear before this Tribunal and prove if he has any right or interest over the said Trade Mark of the Complainant to use it in the Disputed Domain name.

Hence it is held that the Complainant has satisfied the second element under Paragraph 4 (b) of the Policy.

c) Whether the Respondent domain name was registered or is being used in absolute bad faith?

i) The contention of the Complainant is that The Respondent who had constructive notice of the Complainants' rights in the trademark COLGATE by virtue of the Complainants' widespread reputation, use and registrations and Such knowledge of the Respondent is an indicator of bad faith of the Respondent in registering the disputed domain name and in support of their contention, they produced the decisions in 'Motion Limited v. Privacy Locked LLC/Nat Collicot, WIPO Case No. D2009-0320, SembCorp Industries Limited v. Hu Huan Xin, WIPO Case No. D2001-1092 They contend that The Respondent acquired the confusingly similar domain www.colgate.in very well knowing that the Complainants' business activities under the mark COLGATE and through the domains/websites www.colgate.com, www.colgatepalmolive.co.in and www.colgate.co.in are huge and very popular across the globe and that is why the Respondent grabbed the domain www.colgate.in. It is nothing but an opportunistic bad faith registration on the part of the Respondent to register a domain name having the registered trademark of the Complainants. It is their further contention that the mala fides of the Respondent are evident from the fact that the impugned domain name as registered by the Respondent suggests that the Respondent proposes to use the same for providing services such as Consulting, Marketing, Strategy, E-Commerce, Web Development, Investment, Branding etc. by impersonating as the Complainants. The Respondent is unauthorizedly using the Complainants' well-known trademark COLGATE and the associated name and fame, taking undue advantage of the same and making huge profits by diverting internet traffic to avail they services by impersonating as the Complainants and asking the unsuspecting internet users to contact them through their email samvadgroup@gmail.com and mobile no. +91 9811802164 given on the one pager uploaded on the domain www.colgate.in. They argue that The Respondent has registered the impugned domain name, with a view to extort money from the

Complainants. The Respondent, by creating the domain name has blocked the Complainants of their legitimate right of registering a domain name that incorporates their trademark. Such acts of the Respondent also amount to domain name squatting. Therefore, the Complainants state that the Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

ii) The Complainant pleads that the Registrant is a domain squatter and is not making any legitimate commercial use of the domain www.colgate.in which can be seen from the fact that the domain does not resolve into any fully functional website and it only hosts a one pager, where the mobile no. and email ID of the Respondent is mentioned. The domain name has been created by the Respondent to make unjust gains by depriving the Complainants of their legitimate rights to register an identical domain name. They argue that the Respondent's acts are clearly an attempt to pass off its goods and services as that of the Complainants' and there is every possibility that the Respondent is intending to make unlawful economic gain by exploiting the well-known trademark COLGATE as well as the name, fame and popularity of the interest in the domain name www.colgate.in They would further contend that the general proposition that the registration of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark of the Complainants is in bad faith has been upheld by numerous UDRP decisions and Some notable cases which have upheld this proposition are Marie Claire Album v. Marie-Claire Apparel, Inc Case No D 2003 0767, Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co. Case No D 2000 0163 and Adidas-Salomon AG v. Domain Locations Case No D 2003 0489, wherein it has been held that registration of a well-known trademark of which the Respondent must reasonably have been aware is in itself sufficient to amount to bad faith. It is reiterated that the Respondent has not made any legitimate offering of goods or services under the Complainants' trade/service mark COLGATE through the disputed domain name. Hence, this is a classic case of domain squatting and bad faith registration by the Respondent thereby usurping the reputation and goodwill of the Complainants' trademark COLGATE

through the disputed domain www.colgate.in. and It is therefore submitted that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

iii) From the evidence placed before this Tribunal it is evident that

Firstly, the Respondent used the 'COLGATE' trademark without consent from the Complainant.

Secondly, Respondent was aware of Complainant's rights in its well-known trademark as a consequence of Complainant's substantial use of the trademark which predates before the Respondent acquired the domain name.

Thirdly, the domain name is only registered with no apparent legitimate purpose and holding on to the same with absolutely no justification except to make wrongful profit therefrom. Non-use, registration of domain soon after acquisition and passive holding are evidence of bad faith registration. *Fourthly*, The Respondent **impersonated** the Complainant's Trademark 'COLGATE' which demonstrates its purpose to deceive users for commercial benefit and to harm Complainant's business by redirecting people to the infringing domain name and also making illegitimate commercial gains by banking on the hard-earned goodwill and reputation of the Complainant which is done in bad faith.

iv) In *HSBC Holdings [!_]lc v. Hooman Esmail Zadeh*, INDRP Case no 032, dated March 20, 2007; *Visteon Corporation v. Prahlad S.*, INDRP Case No. 1535, dated May 6, 2022; *Solidium Oy v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehfl EstormH Etormhosting. Estorm Programming*, WIPO Case No. D2022-3139; *LPL Financial LLC v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf I Steffen Hain*, WIPO Case No. D2022-0542 it was held that the mere registration of an identical domain name by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

On careful consideration of the above findings, the Arbitral Tribunal accepts the contentions of the Complainant and holds that the Respondent domain name <WWW.COLGATE.IN> has been registered with an opportunistic intention and is being

used in bad faith and therefore, the third element in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy has been satisfied.

VIII. DISPOSITIONS

The Arbitral Tribunal holds that The three elements set out in paragraph 4 of the INDRP Policy that

- i) The Respondent domain name <www.COLGATE.IN> is identical and confusingly similar to the name, trademark and brand name 'COLGATE' by the Complainant.
- ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Complainant's Trademark 'COLGATE'
- iii) the Disputed Domain name has been registered in bad faith

have been established by the Complainant and hence It is entitled for the relief sought for.

For the foregoing reasons stated above, The Arbitral Tribunal directs that:
The Disputed Domain Name www.colgate.in be transferred to the Complainant as prayed for.

In the Result, Complaint Allowed as prayed for. No Costs.

Place: Chennai

Dated: 12th December 2025


(M.SHIRIJHA)

solle Arbitrator.

M.SHIRIJHA B.SC., M.L.
STS Law Associates
2/669A, River View Enclave, First Main Road,
Manapakkam, Chennai - 600 125.