



Y 562625

DE. SUBRAMANIAM CHINNAIDAM,
STAMP VENDOR,
E. No. 14/190/1/38
HIGH COURT CAMPUS,
CHENNAI-600 104. (TAMIL NADU)

D. SARAVANAN

Advocate, Arbitrator & Mediator
"Orient Chambers" No. 90 (Old No. 73),
4th & 5th Floor, Armenian Street,
Chennai - 600 001.
Phone : 044 - 4206 3051

தமிழ்நாடு தமில்நாடு TAMILNADU

5/340
F- 4 NOV 2011

BEFORE THE SOLE ARBITRATOR MR.D.SARAVANAN
.IN REGISTRY
(C/o. NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA)

Disputed Domain Name: www.boroline.co.in

G.D.Pharmaceuticals Private Limited
Asha Mahal, 94, Nalini Ranjan Avenue
Kolkata - 700 053, India.
boroline@cal.vsnl.net.in
cal@patentindia.com

Complainant

Vs.

Mr. Duan Zuochun
Xiangzhouqu Jida Bailianlu 188 Hao
Zhongtonggongyedsha2Lou
Zhuhai, Guangdong
519000, China.
domainlaw@foxmail.com

Respondent





தமிழ்நாடு தமில்நாடு TAMILNADU

V 379231

5/36X
8 NOV 2011

D. SARAVANAN
Advocate, Arbitrator & Mediator
"Orient Clearers" No. 90 (Old No. 73),
4th & 5th Floor, Arambion Street,
Chennai - 600 004.
Phone : 044 - 4295 3051

P.S. SHANMUGA SUNDARAM,
STAMP VENDOR,
L No 34 / 103 / 28
HIGH COURT CAMPUS,
CHENNAI-600 104. (TAMIL NADU)

-2-

1. The Parties:

The complainant is G.D.Pharmaceuticals Private Limited, Asha Mahal, 94, Nalini Ranjan Avenue, Kolkata - 700 053, India. Rep. by its authorised representative M/s S.Majumdar & Co., Trademark and Patent Attorneys.

The respondent is Mr. Duan Zuochun, Xiangzhouqu Jida Bailianlu 188 Hao, Zhongtonggongyedsha2Lou, Zhuhai, Guangdong 519000, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar:

The disputed domain name:

www.boroline.co.in



The domain name registered with .IN REGISTRY

3. Procedural History:

- September 15, 2011 : The .IN REGISTRY appointed D.SARAVANAN as Sole Arbitrator from its panel as per paragraph 5(b) of INDRP Rules of Procedure.
- September 16, 2011 : Mr.D.SARAVANAN, Arbitrator accorded his consent.
- September 30, 2011 : Arbitral proceedings were commenced by sending notice to Respondent through e-mail as per Paragraph 4(c) of INDRP Rules of Procedure, marking a copy of the same to Complainant's authorized representative and .IN REGISTRY.
- October 10, 2011 : Due date for filing Response by Respondent.
- November 03, 2011 : Arbitrator sent an e-mail to Respondent notifying his default, a copy of which was marked to Complainant's authorised representative and the .IN REGISTRY.
- : The language of the proceedings in English.

4. Factual Background:

4.1 The Complainant:

The complainant is G.D.Pharmaceuticals Private Limited, Asha Mahal, 94, Nalini Ranjan Avenue, Kolkata - 700 053, India. Rep. by its authorised representative M/s S.Majumdar & Co., Trademark and Patent Attorneys.

4.2 Complainant's Activities:

The Complainant states that it is one of the most well-known renowned and established multidimensional Indian Companies duly incorporated under the provisions of The



Companies Act, 1956, having various Branch Offices in almost all major cities and almost all States in India; with its untiring efforts the Complainant has carved out a niche for itself to become one of the biggest employment providers and indeed one of the biggest revenue generators for India; the Complainant has a large number of marketing sectors and units operating throughout the length and breadth of India; suffice to say the Complainant is at its booming stage because of its ever-expanding business; the Complainant also exports several of its items/products to many countries of the world as it manufactures, deals, offers for sale, sells products relating to medicine and cosmetics.

4.3 Complainant's Trading Name:

(i) The Complainant states that it has a world wide presence in diverse fields including products like cosmetics, toiletries, soaps, talcum powder, shampoo, hair oils, essential oil, cream and lotion, perfumery and deodorants and all other personal care products included in Class 3 and also goods like pharmaceutical and medicinal preparation included in Class 5; each of the aforesaid products under the trademark(s) like Boroline, Eleen, Penorub, Suthol etc., which are now house-hold names in India are easily and widely available in the market(s); the Complainant has its various sister concerns, through which it carries on its business operations; the Complainant is using various trademarks for its products and none of them are common dictionary word(s) as each of them have been coined and adopted by the Complainant itself; one of such word/ mark chosen and since used by the Complainant uninterruptedly, continuously, without any break is BOROLINE; the said trademark BOROLINE was adopted by the Complainant way back in the year 1929 and has since then been used and forms an essential and prominent feature of its product; the Complainant adopted the said trademark BOROLINE for its product antiseptic creams in a unique get-up, packaging and colour scheme; the said BOROLINE trademark is today world renowned and synonymous with the Complainant and none else; additionally the trademark BOROLINE continues to remain the Complainant's principal trademark; the said trademark BOROLINE has earned immense enviable goodwill and reputation; in India, the Complainant has obtained several registrations of the said trademark BOROLINE.



Registration No./Date	Date of Registration	Trademark	Class
198670	27.10.1960	BOROLINE	3
848581	30.03.1999	BOROLINE NOPRIX	3
848585	30.03.1999	BOROLINE'S NOPRIX	3
917595	12.04.2000	BOROLINE'S DEA	3
1096833	19.04.2002	BOROLINE'S KHAS	3
1051128	10.10.2001	BOROLINE'S bo	3
1053353	19.10.2001	BOROLINE'S	3
14610	19.04.1943	BOROLINE (Label)	5
14611	19.04.1943	BOROLINE (Carton)	5
371269	21.01.1981	BOROLINE	5
1491772	27.09.2006	BOROLINE (Carton)	5
1491773	27.09.2006	BOROLINE (Label)	5
1053356	19.10.2001	BOROLINE'S	5

(ii) Each of the said registrations have been renewed from time to time and are valid and subsisting in favour of the Complainant; by virtue thereof and by virtue of the provisions of The Trade Marks Act, 1999, the Complainant has the exclusive right to use the said trademarks *inter-alia* in respect of the goods for which the said trademark(s) are used and registered and to obtain the relief of infringement against any party such as the Respondent herein. Copies of the status pages of the aforesaid registration as available on the website of the Trade Marks Registry are collectively marked as *Annexure 'C'*; the goods manufactured by the Complainant under the trademark BOROLINE are sold in every part of the country and are also exported to several countries of the world. Because of its long enduring efforts, dint and time-spent, the Complainant has been able to have large turnovers which exceeds several hundred Lakhs of rupees;

(iii) Additionally, the Complainant has also expended huge sum in extensively publicizing its products under its trademark BOROLINE by advertising them through various mediums, including print and media. Copies of the promotional material and invoices evincing expenditure incurred by the Complainant on advertisement is collectively



marked as *Annexure 'D'*. By virtue of extensive and continuous use of such trademark BOROLINE by the Complainant along with its wide publicity and promotion, the said trademark has acquired valuable goodwill and reputation throughout India and abroad; the Complainant is the sole rightful owner of the said trademark and no other person/entity/company other than Complainant's own sister concerns, if at all, can use any/or is entitled to use the same as its trademark, trade name or otherwise; whenever any reference is made to BOROLINE it only refers to the Complainant; the Complainant is also the owner of the domain name www.boroline.com and has been using the same to advertise and disseminate information about its products. A copy of the home page of the said website is marked as *Annexure 'E'*; in view of prior established user, immense reputation and enormous goodwill enjoyed by the complainant's trademark BOROLINE and the subsisting registrations, no one else has a legitimate right or interest to adopt the mark/word BOROLINE as any use of the same/almost identical/deceptively similar mark/word by any other person in respect of any classification of goods whatsoever, other than by the complainant, is inevitably bound to create confusion amongst the trade and the purchasing public.

(iv) On June 11, 2011 the Respondent claiming to be the Contact Person of China Domain Law Office sent an e-mail to the complainant informing the Complainant that the domain names www.boroline.co.in being the subject matter of the present Complaint and the domain name www.boroline.in was for sale and he can be contacted if the Complainant is interested. A copy of the said e-mail is annexed and marked as Annexure 'F'; the Complainant was rather surprised to receive the said e-mail and immediately contacted its Intellectual Property Attorney; it was apparent to the said representative that Mr.Duan had registered the domain names, solely with the ulterior motive of making illegal profits from the sale thereof. The Respondent had contacted the Complainant with the knowledge that the Complainant was the true and rightful owner of the mark/name BOROLINE; in order to veil their true identity and to ascertain the true intention of the Respondent, the representatives of the Complainant wrote to the Respondent, through a personal e-mail id quoting a price of USD200 for the transfer of the domain names www.boroline.in and www.boroline.co.in; the said representative was not surprised to receive a counter offer of USD3000 for the transfer of both the aforesaid domain names which clearly established the



fact that the sole intent behind registering both the domain names comprising the word/mark BOROLINE was to illegally encash the goodwill attached thereto and make illegal profits by selling the same to the Complainant or to a third party for gain. A copy of the communication between the veiled identity of the representative of the Complainant and the respondent is marked as *Annexure 'G'*.

4.4 Respondent's Identity and activities:

The Respondent is the registrant of the Domain Name <boroline.co.in> which is registered with .IN REGISTRY, National Internet Exchange of India, New Delhi. The name of the registrant is referred to as Mr. Duan Zuochun, Xiangzhouqu Jida Bailianlu 188 Hao, Zhongtonggongyedsha2Lou, Zhuhai, Guangdong 519000, China. Neither the Respondent represented himself nor represented by any one.

5. Parties contentions:

A. Complainant:

(a) The Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a Trademark or service mark of the Complainant has rights:

It is stated that the impugned domain name comprising of the mark/word BOROLINE is identical to the well-known trademark BOROLINE of the Complainant. The Respondent's impugned domain name is identical to the trademark BOROLINE in which the Complainant has exclusive rights.

(b) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name:

It is stated that the Respondent has no legitimate rights or interest in the impugned domain name. The home page under the said URL notifies that the said domain name may be for sale by its owner and contains myriad sponsored listings leading to other web pages. It is apparent that the Respondent has been using the impugned domain as a parking page. The Respondent is not in any way associated with the Complainant and has neither sought nor received any authorization from the



Complainant being the proprietor of the said trademark to use the same as a part of its domain name. The Respondent has not made any legitimate offering of goods or services under the Complainant's BOROLINE mark. Instead, it diverts Internet users to third party web page. It is stated that neither does the Respondent use the impugned domain name to offer bonafide goods or services nor is he known/associated with the name BOROLINE.

(c) Respondent has registered and is using the domain name in bad faith:

(i) The Respondent has registered the impugned domain name in bad faith, i.e. primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark to a competitor of the Complainant, for a valuable consideration. This is corroborated by the fact that a link on the right hand corner of the home page of the impugned domain name asks users to click for 'more details'. The said hyperlink opens another web page which clearly informs the user that the domain name www.boroline.co.in is for sale and makes an invitation to place an offer for purchasing the same in lieu of valuable consideration. The said hyperlink leads a user to a domain name auction website www.sedo.co.uk (*Annexure B*). The fact that the information regarding the sale of the impugned domain name was made available publicly and that Respondent invited offers, indicates that Respondent's intention was to receive the highest possible price for the impugned domain name. The Panel in *Bell-Phillip Television Productions v. Make A. Aford (Tim Wenk)* (WIPO Case No. D2000-0180) have held such acts demonstrate that the Registrants does not have legitimate rights or business interest in the disputed domain name. A copy of WIPO Case No. D200-0180 is marked as *Annexure 'H'*. The Panel in *AT&T Corp v. rnetworkd* (WIPO Case No.D2006-0569) has also held "*that the Respondents conduct in attempting to sell the Domain Name – confusingly similar to the Complainant's famous marks (and probably those of Yahoo! Inc. as well) – through an auction website is indicative of bad faith*". A copy of WIPO Case No. D2006-0569 is marked as *Annexure*



(ii) It is stated that the respondent has wrongfully acquired the domain name 'BOROLINE.IN' and registered the same in its favour. The complainant further states that by using the impugned domain name the Respondent has intentionally intended to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to his website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of his website or location or of a product or service on his website or location. It is apparent that the Respondent had knowledge about the Complainant since it is the Respondent who had approached the Complainant on June 11, 2011 by inviting them to place an offer. Further, it is apparent from the home page of the impugned website that annexed hereto as "Annexure B" that the impugned domain name contains links to several third party websites not associated with the Complainant. The home page of the impugned domain name contains sponsored links from which the Respondent undoubtedly generates income. This act of the Respondent satisfies Paragraph 6(iii) of the INDRP which imputes bad faith on a respondent who by using the domain name, intentionally attempts to attract Internet users to the Registrant's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's name or mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Registrant's website or location or of a product or service on the Registrant's website or location. In the matter at hand the Respondent is using the famous trademark BOROLINE of the Complainant, having knowledge of the same to attract unwary users to the impugned webpage and thereby earn through the sponsored listings from click through advertising. In WIPO Case No.D2002-1064 (The Vanguard Group Inc. v Lorna Kang) the administrative panel held that *'the Respondent knew of the Complainant's well known VANGUARD trademark and registered and is using the disputed domain name in order to confuse and divert internet traffic to the Respondent's website, based upon the following circumstances: (a) the Complainant's VANGUARD trademark is well known and specific to the Complainant in connection with financial products and services; (b) the Complainant's <vanguard.com> domain name and related website have received substantial publicity; (c) there is no apparent connection or relationship between the disputed domain name and the Respondent or its website or its content; (d) there is no other apparent legitimate justification for the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name for its website; (e) the*



Respondent has not denied any knowledge of the Complainant or its trademark and (f) the disputed domain name is a confusingly similar misspelling of the Complainant's <vanguard.com> domain name. In addition the Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent's failure to provide any explanation or rationale for its use of the disputed domain name for its website. The Panel also finds that the Respondent's website results in commercial gain to the Respondent. It is well known that many websites generate revenue from click-through advertising, by directing traffic to other websites, and other online marketing techniques. In the absence of any reply by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Respondent's website generates revenue for the Respondent in that manner." A copy of the aforesaid decision is marked as **Annexure 'J'**.

(iii) It is further stated that the existence of the impugned domain name was brought to the notice of the Complainant when the Respondent directly sent an e-mail (**Annexure F**) to the Complainant informing them the impugned domain name is for sale. Further when the Representative of the Complainant contacted the Respondent through a veiled identity, the Respondent immediately replied with a counter offer of USD 3000 being the consideration for the transfer of the impugned domain name and also the domain name www.boroline.in. Reference ought to be drawn to Paragraph 6(i) of the INDRP which establishes bad faith registration where the Registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant, who bears the name or is the owner of the trademark or service mark, or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Registrant's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name. It is stated that the conduct of the Respondent falls within the ambit of Paragraph 6(i) of the INDRP. It has also been observed in **WIPO Case No.D2000-1639 (EADS Deutschland GmbH et al. v. Wolfgang Koellen)** that "*An offer to sell a domain name registration to the trademark owner or a third party for an excessive price is one of the hallmarks of a cybersquatter and has been cited in a number of WIPO decisions as evidence that a domain name has been registered and used in bad faith. In the case of Wrestling Fed'n Entertainment, Inc. v. Bosman (D1999-0001), an offer to sell domain name for \$1,000 was evidence of bad faith. Similarly, in the case of Stella D'oro Biscuit Co. v. Patron Group*



(D2000-0012) *bad faith has been asserted where somebody tried sell a domain name for \$2,300*". A copy of the aforesaid case is marked as **Annexure 'K'**.

(iv) The Complainant further states that they have not licensed or otherwise permitted the respondent to use its trademark 'BOROLINE', nor has it permitted the respondent to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the mark; the impugned domain name 'BOROLINE.IN' is identical to the complainant's registered trademark 'BOROLINE' which enjoys reputation, goodwill and recognition of very high order and is a well-known trademark; the respondent has no right to and legitimate interest in the domain name 'BOROLINE.IN'. The respondent illegally and wrongfully adopted the word 'BOROLINE' of the Complainant with the intention to create an impression of an association with the Complainant.

(v) The Complainant further states that popularity of the trademark/word BOROLINE and the legitimacy of the exclusive claims thereto by the Complainant have already become a subject matter of a domain dispute before the WIPO Arbitration & Mediation Center in Case No D2001-1277. In the said Case the Panel was pleased to decide the Case in favour of the Complainant and found that the trademark BOROLINE is well known in India and that the Complainant has exclusive rights on the same. A copy of the decision is marked as **Annexure 'L'**.

(vi) The Complainant further states that the mark 'BOROLINE' was adopted by the respondent despite being well aware of the prior existence of the Complainant's well - known trademark 'BOROLINE' and the goodwill attached to it. The concerned trade and the public are acquainted with the complainant's trademark BOROLINE and whenever they will find any goods/services under the said mark BOROLINE and/or BOROLINE in conjunction with other words/ label, they presume that the same has originated from the complainant only and no one else. As such the conduct of the respondent clearly reflects the dishonesty involved in their course of action.

(vii) It is also stated that by virtue of the widespread use and reputation of the Complainant's well-known trademark 'BOROLINE' it becomes apparent that both



members of the public and trade would associate the impugned domain name with the Complainant and would believe that the respondent is in some way associated with the Complainant. Under such circumstances, a likelihood of confusion and/or deception is bound to occur in the minds of the public and trade about the accused mark as to its source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement. Undoubtedly an unwary person while searching for details of the complainant's business and products in the .IN based domain name is likely to land up in the web pages under the impugned domain name and is likely to presume a connection between the business and products of the Complainant and the respondent.

(viii) The Complainant states that the registration, its maintenance or renewal is based on the policies of the .IN domain Registry which includes the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP). The Complainant states that the registrants are subject to the policy and when an application for registration of a domain name is made by any person there is an implied representation made by the applicant as provided in the said policy.

It is further stated that bad faith is apparent from the facts and circumstances of the case and therefore the respondent is disentitled to maintain and/or renew the impugned domain name. The respondent had no justification in adopting the name BOROLINE.IN as its domain name other than for wrongful and illegal gains. It is stated that there has been no use of the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bonafide offering of goods or services by the respondent. The respondent is not commonly known by the domain name and has not acquired any trademark or service mark rights to the knowledge of the Complainant.

The respondent is not making any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark of the complainant. The conduct of the respondent leaves no doubt as to his unscrupulous motive and illegal intentions and the complainant is certain that the respondent is in active search of an assignee of the impugned domain name and would sell the same and make illegal profit. In view of the aforesaid the Complainant states that they



are entitled to appropriate remedies from the Ld. Registry which ought to direct the transfer of the impugned domain name in favour of the Complainant.

B. Respondent:

The Respondent did not submit any response.

6. Discussion and Findings:

(a) It has to be asserted as to whether the Constitution of Arbitral Tribunal was proper? And Whether the Respondent has received the notice of this Arbitral Tribunal?

(b) Having gone through the procedural history, this Tribunal comes to the irresistible conclusion that the Arbitral Tribunal was properly constituted and Respondent has been notified of the complaint of the Complainant. However, the Respondent did not choose to submit any response, and that non-submission of the Response by the Respondent had also been notified to the Respondent on 3rd November, 2011.

(c) Under paragraph 4 of the IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements of its case:

- (i) The Respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) The Respondent's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

(a) Identical or confusing similarity:



i) The Arbitral Tribunal finds that the Complainant has provided evidences that it possesses registered Trade / Service Marks "BOROLINE". The Respondent's domain name, <boroline.co.in>, consists of entirely Complainant's trademark, except .co and ccTLD. Thus, this Arbitral Tribunal comes to the irresistible conclusion that the disputed domain name <boroline.co.in> is confusingly similar or identical to the Complainant's marks.

ii) The Arbitral Tribunal concludes that the Complainant has established paragraph 4(i) of the IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy.

(b) Respondent's Rights or Legitimate Interests:

i) The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Paragraph 7 of the IN Dispute Resolution Policy sets out three elements, any of which shall demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent had been given the opportunity to respond and to present evidence in support of the elements in paragraph 7 of the INDRP. The Respondent has not chosen to do so and has not filed any response in this proceedings to establish any circumstances that could assist it in demonstrating, any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Although, the Complainant is not entitled to relief simply by default of the Respondent to submit a Response, the Arbitral Tribunal can however and does draw evidentiary inferences from the failure of the Respondent to respond. The Complainant has established a prima facie case of lack of rights and legitimate interest and the Respondent has failed to rebut the presumption of absence of rights or legitimate interests. Considering the above, and based on the record, the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as the Respondent's current use is neither an example of a bona fide offering of goods or services as required under paragraph 7(i) of the Policy nor is there any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and as such there is no evidence that paragraphs 7(ii) or 7(iii) of the Policy apply. The Complainant asserts that they have not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use their trademark.



ii) The Arbitral Tribunal is satisfied that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and, accordingly paragraph 4(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

(c) **Registration and Use in Bad faith:**

i) Paragraph 6 of the Policy provides the circumstances evidencing registration and use of a domain name in bad faith are that, by using the same, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct and the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to the Respondent's web site or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's web site or location.

ii) Under Annexure 'B', it is exhibited that the impugned domain name is parked at www.sedo.uk for sale which is well known site for selling domain names which allows registrants to simply park the registered domain names without having to develop any website, and sedo provides and targeted ad links which give a flavour to the interested buyer as to kind of domain name that is on offer. Further, under Annexure 'F', it is categorical that the Respondent himself contacted the Complainant through e-mail offering the disputed domain name in reference, for sale and under Annexure 'G' the Respondent offered USD 3000 for transfer of domain names www.boroline.in and www.boroline.co.in. Such an offer to sell the domain names to its registered trade mark owner is one of the hallmarks of a cybersquatter and suffice to hold that the domain name has been registered and used in bad faith. The Respondent has registered the domain name which appears to have been selected precisely for the reason that it is identical or confusingly similar to registered trademarks and trade names of the Complainant. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant. Registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar or identical to a famous trademark by any entity, which has no relationship to that mark, is itself sufficient evidence of bad faith registration and use.



iii) In view of the submitted evidence and in the specific circumstances of this case, this Arbitral Tribunal draws the inference that Respondent's purpose of registering the domain name was in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy. The Respondent has no legitimate rights or interests in the disputed domain name and there was no real purpose for registering the disputed domain name other than for commercial gains, and that the intention of the Respondent was solely to generate revenue, through the sale of the disputed domain name to the registered owner of the trade mark or to a competitor or any other person that has the potential to cause damage to the ability of the Complainant to have peaceful usage of the Complainant's legitimate interest in using their own trade names.

(iv) In the light of the above, this Arbitral Tribunal finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

7. Decision:

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 10 of the Policy, the Arbitral Tribunal orders that the disputed domain name <boroline.co.in> be transferred to the Complainant.

Dated at Chennai (India) on this 8th November, 2011.


(D.SARAVANAN)
Sole Arbitrator