



IN THE MATTER OF THE ARBITRATION ACT 1996 as Amended by  
Arbitration & Conciliation (Amendment) Act,2015  
and  
INDRP Rules of Procedure;  
and  
.IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP)  
and  
In the matter of arbitration between

BOSCH REXROTH (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED

Sanand Viramgam Highway Taluka

Sanand, Ahmedabad, Sanand,

Gujarat - 382170, India

...Complainant

Vs

REXROTH DISTRIBUTORS

Haryana Office - T 140/52,

Ansal Sushant City, Kundali,

Sonipat, Haryana, India- 131028

Also at - Rohini, New Delhi India - 110085

.... Respondent

in respect of Disputed Domain Name(s):

[www.rexrothdistributor.in]

INDRP Case No; 2083

FINAL AWARD

Date: 05.06.2026

Venue: New Delhi, India



ABHINAV S. RAGHUVANSHI  
SOLE ARBITRATOR

Table of Contents

S.NO	PARTICULARS	PAGE NO.
A.	The Parties and their Representative	1
B.	The Domain Name and Registrar	1
C.	Procedural History	2
D.	Complainant Contention	3-5
E.	Respondent Contention	5-8
F.	Discussion and Findings	8-12
G.	Decision	13



A. **THE PARTIES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVE:**

1. **Claimant**

BOSCH REXROTH (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED  
Sanand Viramgam Highway Taluka Sanand,  
Ahmedabad, Sanand,  
Gujarat - 382170, India

**Legal Representative**

Mr. Julick Isaiah  
Of M/s. DePenning & DePenning  
(Patents, Trademarks, Designs, Copyright)  
120 Velachery Main Road, Guindy,  
Chennai - 600 032 INDIA  
Tel : +91 44 4221 3444  
Fax: +91 44 4221 3402  
Email: [domain@depenning.com](mailto:domain@depenning.com)

2. **Respondent**

Rexroth Distributors Rohini  
New Delhi, Delhi - 110085 ,  
India, IN  
Tel: +91 8447057631  
Email: [rexrothdistributors@gmail.com](mailto:rexrothdistributors@gmail.com)

B. **THE DOMAIN NAMES AND REGISTRAR:**

The disputed domain name [www.rexrothdistributor.in](http://www.rexrothdistributor.in) is registered through the Registrar Godaddy.com LLC is accredited with the .IN Registry and is listed on the website of the .IN Registry having its Contact Address:

Rexroth Distributors Rohini  
New Delhi, Delhi - 110085 ,  
India, IN  
Tel: +91 8447057631  
Email: [rexrothdistributors@gmail.com](mailto:rexrothdistributors@gmail.com)



C. **PROCEDURAL HISTORY:**

1. Sh. Abhinav S. Raghuvanshi was appointed as the sole Arbitrator by the NIXI to act as an Arbitrator in the INDRP case no. 2083 regarding the complaint dated 08<sup>th</sup> December, 2025 filed under the INDRP by the Complainant.
2. That the Arbitral Tribunal upon receipt of Complaint, issued the Notice of Arbitration on 05<sup>th</sup> January 2026 and further directed the Complainant to effect the service into the Respondent and file an Affidavit of Service to the effect. 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 within 15(fifteen) days.
3. The service of the Notice of Arbitration dated 05<sup>th</sup> January 2026 was affected by the counsel for the complainant, and the same was intimated to the Tribunal by Julick Isaiah, representative of the complainant on 05<sup>th</sup> January 2026 & 14<sup>th</sup> January 2026. The complaint (with annexures) was sent to the email address of the Respondent shown in the WHOIS details. Consequently, the service of the Notice of Arbitration on the Respondent was done in accordance with Rule (2) of the INDRP Rules.
4. In the interest of Justice, the Arbitral Tribunal under Rule 13 of the INDRP Rules of Procedure directed the Complainant to once again affect service of this Notice of Arbitration along with copy of Complaint and Annexure, complete in all respects by to the Respondent.
5. The Respondent responded to Notice of Arbitration dated 05<sup>th</sup> January 2026 and filed their response on 12<sup>th</sup> January, 2026 in INDRP Case No. 2083.
6. Subsequently, the Arbitral Tribunal issued directions to Complainant and the Respondent to file their respective Evidence Affidavits, duly notarized and sworn.
7. In compliance to the directions issued by the Tribunal, the Complainant filed their Evidence Affidavit on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2026. Additionally, the Complainant also filed their rejoinder vide email dated 16<sup>th</sup> February 2026 in response of Respondent' reply.

D. COMPLAINANT CONTENTION:

It is case of the Complainant that:

- i. The Complainant states that the Complainant BOSCH REXROTH (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED, is a private limited company under the Indian Companies Act which has been incorporated in India since 18Th February, 1974. The Complaint caters to the following industries in India such as agriculture and forestry, automotive, battery production, chemical processing, construction and infrastructure, consumer goods, energy and utilities, healthcare, hydrogen, logistics and transport, materials and resources, pharmaceuticals, recycling and waste handling, renewable energies, semiconductors and electronics and testing technology. The Complainant is a part of Bosch Rexroth AG, a German company headquartered at Jahnstraße 3-5, D-97816 Lohr am Main, Germany. The Complainant traces its origins back to 1795, when Georg Ludwig Rexroth established an iron foundry. Over the centuries, it evolved into a leading provider of industrial technologies, expanding into hydraulics, electric drives, control systems and eventually merged with the Bosch Group.
- ii. The Complainant further states that the Complainant's group provides automation solutions tailored for both industrial and mobile applications. The innovative products and services offered by the Complainant group empower customers to transport everything that requires movement with both ease and efficiency, thereby assisting them in achieving success within their respective sectors. The Complainant's group is actively contributing to shaping the future. By prioritizing digital innovation, sustainability, and human resources, the Complainant is not merely facilitating movement but is also transforming industries to enhance the well-being of the planet. A brief profile of the Complainant's group has been attached by the Complainant as **Annexure- C** alongwith the Complaint.
- iii. The Complainant furthermore states that the Complainant focuses on drive and control technologies, which include hydraulics, electric drives, and assembly technologies designed for mobile applications, factory automation, and process plant engineering. The Complainant engages in the design, development, and production of these components and systems, providing solutions that enhance the speed, efficiency, and safety of machinery and industrial processes. Their products are utilized across various industries, such as automotive, aerospace,

providing solutions that enhance the speed, efficiency, and safety of machinery and industrial processes. Their products are utilized across various industries, such as automotive, aerospace, and renewable energy, and they also provide services like technical support, training, and digital solutions.

- iv. The Complainant asserts that the Complainant's unique industry expertise has become synonymous with tailored solutions. From forging iron out of ore to a foundry for cast iron, the Complainant entered the hydraulics market in the 1950s and laid the foundation to become a global market leader & the merger of Mannesmann Rexroth with Bosch Automationstechnik establishes a global leader for Drive & Control solutions. Notably, the Complainant has reached new levels of seamless integration of all relevant technologies for improved energy efficiency and safety and the Complainant drives the digital transformation of the factory of the future, exceeds the limits with connected hydraulics and sets the stage for transforming mobile machines, wherein, all products and solutions contribute to a more sustainable development of machines, manufacturing and daily life.
- v. The Complainant further asserts that the mark REXROTH has always been part of the Complainant group's trading name and trademark which is also used in conjunction with BOSCH & the repute and the popularity of the trademark and trade-name REXROTH has been unequivocally etched in the minds of the Indian consumers as well as members of the trade on account its incessant use and stellar reputation. Notably, the trademark and trade name REXROTH is also prominently used and displayed in all its websites, including its official website <https://www.boschrexroth.com/>.
- vi. The Complainant highlights that in addition to the recognized common law rights associated with the trade and service mark REXROTH in India and multiple jurisdictions, the Complainant's group is the registered owner of the REXROTH trademark in more than 100 countries globally including India. A list of the registrations for the trademark in India and around the world along with few copies of the registration certificates has been attached by the Complainant as Annexure-D along with the Complaint.
- vii. The Complainant further highlights that the Complainant's group has devoted an enormous amount of time, effort, and energy to promoting and advertising the REXROTH and the said



mark is consequently identified solely with the Complainant and has a significant online presence.

A snapshot of Google search results has been attached by the Complainant as **Annexure-E** alongwith the Complaint. Also, a list of domain names owned by the Complainant's group has been attached by the Complainant as **Annexure-F** alongwith the Complaint.

**E. RESPONDENT CONTENTION:**

Pursuant to the notice issued by this Tribunal dated 05<sup>th</sup> January, 2026, the Respondent have filed their response on 12<sup>th</sup> January, 2026.

It is the response of the Respondent that :

- i. The Respondent stated that the Disputed Domain Name was registered on 28th May 2022 through the publicly available registration services of GoDaddy.com LLC, a legitimate and globally recognized domain registrar and the registration was conducted in an open, transparent, and competitive market where domain names are available on a first-come, first-served basis to any entity or individual who wishes to lawfully acquire them for legitimate purposes.
- ii. The Respondent further stated that despite the long-standing presence of the Complainant in India since 1947, the Complainant's purported global brand vigilance, failed to secure this particular descriptive domain name combination. Moreover, the Respondent stated that the Respondent's acquisition was a strategic, lawful, and legitimate business decision aimed at creating a distinct online identity for its operations in the industrial components sector.
- iii. The Respondent asserted that the Respondent is a genuine and bona fide business entity operating in the trade, supply, and distribution network of industrial automation, hydraulic, & pneumatic components and the selection of the term "Rexroth Distributor" was fundamentally descriptive and indicative of the intended nature of the Respondent's business activity – i.e., to operate as a distributor or reseller for products that may encompass those associated with the REXROTH brand, alongside other reputable and competing brands in the same engineering sector such as Parker, Eaton, SMC, Festo, etc. The term "distributor" is universally recognized as a generic, descriptive, and non- trademark term that denotes a class of trade or a channel of commerce.



iv. The Respondent further asserted that since the date of registration, the Respondent has made substantial and demonstrable investments – financial, temporal, and entrepreneurial – towards developing the website, establishing backend infrastructure, engaging in search engine optimization (SEO), preliminary marketing outreach, and overall business development linked to the Disputed Domain Name and has made a huge and substantial capital outlay, along with significant opportunity costs, in developing, maintaining & operating the disputed domain name. Notably, the considerable financial and operational investment clearly demonstrates the Respondent's serious, bona fide and good-faith intention to use the disputed domain name for a legitimate commercial purpose, and not as a mere placeholder, speculative asset, or for any malafide intent.

v. The Respondent highlights that a prominent, unambiguous, and easily visible disclaimer was added to the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name from the very first day of the creation and launch of the website, and the same has been continuously displayed since inception. The disclaimer explicitly and prominently states on the website:

"**Disclaimer:** The Light Company is not Linked or Associated with any Brand Like Rexroth Parker or Eaton Etc. We are an independent Firm. Brand Images Have been used for Reference Purpose Only." This disclaimer is clearly visible to any visitor accessing the website and demonstrates the Respondent's proactive approach, adopted ab initio, to avoid any potential confusion. This action was neither an admission of guilt nor a reaction to any legal threat, but rather a bona fide and voluntary measure undertaken from the outset, showcasing the Respondent's commitment to transparent and fair business practices, thereby negating any inference of malafide intention or inferred malicious intent.

vi. The Respondent acknowledges that as a factual matter, the Complainant holds registered trademark rights for "REXROTH" in various jurisdictions, including India. However, the legal test under the INDRP is not merely whether a domain name incorporates a trademark in whole, but whether, in its entirety, it creates a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

vii. The Respondent further highlights that the disputed domain name <www.rexrothdistributor.in> is a composite phrase consisting of : (i) the trademark "REXROTH"; (ii) the generic dictionary word "DISTRIBUTOR"; and (iii) the country code Top-

Level Domain (ccTLD) ".in". Therefore, when assessed as a whole, the dominant impression conveyed is not that of the Complainant's official corporate or brand portal, but rather of a website belonging to an entity that distributes products of a type associated with the "Rexroth" name and the addition of the highly descriptive & non-distinctive term "distributor" materially & significantly alters the character and perceived purpose of the domain name. Hence, it transforms it from a potential trademark-specific identifier (like rexroth.in) to a descriptive identifier of a business function or trade category

- viii. The Respondent contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with a genuine intention to use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods/services as the business model of Respondent involves the distribution of industrial components and using a domain name that describes this service ("a distributor for rexroth-compatible or related products") is not only fair but is a classic example of descriptive, good-faith use. Further, the website's purpose is to attract businesses looking for distribution services in this niche, not to deceive customers into believing they are dealing directly with Bosch Rexroth. Moreover, the Respondent contends that the Respondent is making a fair use of a name that describes its business activity, even if that name incorporates another's trademark in a descriptive manner.
- ix. The Respondent further contends that use of the disputed domain name constitutes a legitimate nominative fair use, as it merely refers to and identifies the products it deals in or sources, without suggesting any sponsorship, endorsement, or affiliation with the Complainant. It is submitted by Respondent that the display of product images is a standard industry practice for descriptive and identification purposes. The Respondent further relies upon the prominent disclaimer displayed on its website to demonstrate that visitors are clearly informed of the absence of any relationship with the Complainant or other brands. According to the Respondent, the disclaimer effectively mitigates any likelihood of confusion, reflects its bona fide conduct, and evidences its legitimate interest and good-faith use of the disputed domain name.
- x. The Respondent submits that there is a complete absence of evidence to suggest that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with the specific, targeted intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark as the domain was available on the open market and the term was selected for its core descriptive value within the hydraulic & automation components distribution industry an industry with several major players. Also, the Complainant provides

no proof (such as prior correspondence, patterns of conduct, or admissions) that the Respondent's primary motive at the time of registration was to capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill.

- xi. The Respondent further submits that the specifically prominent display of the disclaimer on the website is a deliberate and effective measure to prevent any likelihood of confusion and this action directly counters the allegation of intentional bad faith use for commercial gain through deception and shows the Respondent's responsible approach.
- xii. The Respondent furthermore submits that the Respondent has not engaged in any of the acts indicative of bad faith under the INDRP Policy; neither offered to sell, rent, or transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant or its competitors for valuable consideration, nor engaged in a pattern of registering trademark-based domain names to prevent trademark owners from reflecting their marks. Moreover, the Respondent contends that its use of the domain name does not disrupt the Complainant's business, as an independent distributor may legitimately operate within the broader supply-chain ecosystem. Further, the Respondent states that the Respondent has not sought to attract internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, and that the substantial investment made in the business, coupled with the prominent disclaimer displayed on the website, is inconsistent with any intent to mislead or deceive consumers.
- xiii. The Respondent affirms that in the present case, the disputed domain name combines the trademark with a term describing a trade role ("distributor"), not a product and this distinction is crucial as it provides a stronger descriptive justification for the Respondent's use.
- xiv. The Respondent further affirms that the Complainant's reliance on INDRP precedents like Case No. 1684 (`boshtools.in`) and Case No. 894 (`bosch.in`) is misplaced and distinguishable as in those cases, the disputed domain names were either the pure trademark (`bosch.in`) or a combination of the trademark and a highly generic product term (`boshtools.in`), which directly mirrored the brand's core commercial identity.

F. **DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS:**

The contentions in the Response submitted by the Respondent, running in Paragraph E (i-xiv), have been carefully considered. I find that the Response appears to be completely vague, devoid



of any cogent legal basis, and unsupported by any material capable of establishing a legitimate defence under the INDRP Policy and Rules. Furthermore, the defence and explanations offered by the Respondent are not in sync with the provisions and requirements of the INDRP Rules. The dominant and essential feature of the disputed domain name "www.rexrothdistributor.in" is the word "REXROTH", which is an exact reproduction of the Complainant's registered trademark and domain name. Significantly, the first and most prominent element of both the Complainant's mark and the disputed domain name www.rexrothdistributor.in is the identical word "REXROTH". The addition of the descriptive suffix "distributor" does not materially alter the overall commercial impression created by the disputed domain name. Consequently, no clear distinction can be drawn between "REXROTH" and "www.rexrothdistributor.in", as the former remains the dominant, distinctive, and source-identifying component of the latter. The mere addition of the descriptive term "distributor" neither imparts distinctiveness nor creates a separate commercial impression capable of distinguishing the disputed domain name from the Complainant's mark. On a visual, phonetic, and conceptual comparison, the impugned domain name remains confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, with "REXROTH" retaining its identity, prominence, and source-indicating function. The explanations advanced by the Respondent for adopting the disputed domain name do not appear reasonable or credible and fail to inspire confidence regarding the bona fides of the registration. Consequently, the disputed domain name is likely to create an impression of association, affiliation, authorization, or endorsement by the Complainant, and the Respondent has failed to establish any legitimate basis for distinguishing its domain name from the Complainant's mark.

The complainant seeks to rely upon paragraph 4 of the .IN Policy, which reads as:

"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:

- a) the Registrant's domain name is identical and/or confusingly similar to a Name, Trademark or Service Mark etc. in which the Complainant has rights; and
- b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- c) the Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith."

And the Complainant seeks to assert that each of the aforementioned factors.

**A. Whether the Respondent's domain name <www.rexrothdistributor.in> is identical to a name, trademark/ Trade name or Service mark, in which the Complainant has right?**



- i. The Complainant affirmed that the Complainant has overwhelming common law and statutory rights in its trademark, **REXROTH** around the world including India. Therefore, the complainant is the sole legitimate owner of the trademark **REXROTH**.
- ii. The Complainant further affirmed that distinctive element of the Respondent's domain name is the term '**REXROTH**', while the word '**DISTRIBUTOR**' is merely descriptive and does not convey any independent brand value.
- iii. The Complainant asserted that the Respondent's registration and use of the domain <www.rexrothdistributor.in> is bound to induce members of the public and trade to believe that the Respondent is the official distributor of the Complainant in India, when it is not so.
- iv. The Complainant further asserted that the disputed domain name incorporates the famous trademark **REXROTH** of the Complainant in its entirety and such adoption and use of the disputed domain name is considered evidence of bad faith registration and use under the **INDRP**.
- v. The Complainant has relied on the decisions of this Hon'ble Arbitration and Mediation Centre, **NIXI** passed in the case of **INDRP:1684 Robert Bosch GmbH, Germany vs IBK Engineers Private Limited, India** www.boschtools.in and a copy of the said order has been attached by the Complainant as **Annexure-G** alongwith the Complaint.
- vi. Thus, it is prima facie clear that the disputed domain name <www.rexrothdistributor.in> is identical and/or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks.

**B. Whether the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name?**

- i. The Complainant contended that the Complainant's group is the sole legitimate owner of the trademark **REXROTH** and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the trademark **REXROTH** or to apply for any domain name incorporating the said trademark.
- ii. The Complainant further contended that the Complainant being aggrieved by the use of the impugned domain name had issued a cease-and-desist notice to the Respondent on 29th

November, 2024. A copy of the notice has been attached by the Complainant as **Annexure -H** alongwith the Complaint.

iii. The Complainant furthermore contended that despite the receipt of the notice, the Respondent has not complied with the demand and continues to operate the website and displaying the Complainant's products.

iv. The Complainant pointed out that the Respondent also has a disclaimer in their website that reads *"The Light Companie is not Linked or Associated with any Brand Like Rexroth Parker or Eaton Etc. We are an independent Firm. Brand Images Have been used for Reference Purpose Only"*. Notably, the mere presence of such a disclaimer does not absolve the Respondent from liability for trademark infringement and passing-off and the imitation & unauthorized use of the Complainant's mark in their domain name, even with a disclaimer, amounts to trademark infringement and passing off.

v. The Complainant further pointed out that the blatant use of the Complainant's brand in the Respondent's domain name, along with the display of the Complainant's products, is likely to mislead consumers and the trade fraternity into believing that there is a connection, affiliation, or endorsement by the Complainant. Moreover, the Complainant pointed out that such conduct not only infringes upon the Complainant's intellectual property rights but also unfairly capitalizes on its established goodwill & reputation and the fact that the Respondent continues to use the domain and display the Complainant's products evidences the Respondent's malafide intent to exploit the commercial goodwill and reputation of the Complainant groups mark **REXROTH**.

vi. The Complainant stated that the impugned domain name of Respondent is a mere copy of the Complainant's trademark **REXROTH** and the Respondent has no plausible reason to adopt the domain <www.rexrothdistributor.in> other than to exploit the commercial goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's trademark **REXROTH**.

vii. Complainant further stated that the disputed domain name <www.rexrothdistributor.in> is bound to induce members of the public and trade to believe that the Respondent is the official distributor of the Complainant's products, when it is not so. Notably, the malafide intent of the Respondent to infringe the Complainant's trademark rights is apparent.



viii. Thus, it is evident that the Respondent registered the domain name for the sole purpose of creating confusion and misleading the general public and is using the disputed domain <www.rexrothdistributor.in> to misappropriate and usurp the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark **REXROTH**. Therefore, the Respondent is not making a legitimate, fair or bona fide use of the domain name.

**C. Whether the Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith?**

- i. The Complainant highlighted that going by the imitation of the Complainant's mark, it is obvious that the intention of the Respondent is to attract the Complainant's customers to the infringing website.
- ii. The Complainant affirmed that the Respondent does not have any rights over the word **REXROTH** hence, the registration and use of the domain name <www.rexrothdistributor.in> without any authorization or approval from the Complainant evidences the Respondent's apparent bad faith.
- iii. The Complainant further affirmed that considering the incessant use, reputation, and well-known status of the Complainant's mark in India, the illegitimate adoption and use of the impugned domain name will result in brand dilution which cannot be compensated monetarily.
- iv. The Complainant further highlighted that in various precedents, the domain names are fast-emerging corporate assets and have evolved as a fulcrum of a company's visibility and marketing operations wherein business transactions are primarily being carried out only through internet addresses rather than street addresses, post boxes, or even faxes. Hence, it becomes critical that unscrupulous individuals are not allowed to usurp renowned trademarks and domain names to unfairly benefit from such acts.
- v. The Complainant relied on the case of **Robert Bosch GmbH, Germany vs Zhao Ke, China INDRP case No. 894 <bosch.in>** wherein it was stated that the very use of a domain name by someone with no connection with the Complainant suggests opportunistic bad faith. A copy of the said order has been attached by the Complainant as **Annexure-I** alongwith the Complaint.
- vi. Thus, it is established that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name and is using the disputed domain name, in bad faith.

G. DECISION:

In the light of foregoing discussions, it is abundantly clear that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant have rights, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of disputed domain name. It can be clearly held that the Complainant succeeded in establishing that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent in bad faith and being used in bad faith in accordance with the policy and rules.

This Tribunal, therefore, orders that the domain name <www.rexrothdistributor.in> be transferred to the Complainant.



Abhinav S. Raghuvanshi

Sole Arbitrator

Place: New Delhi

Date: 05.06.2026