



தமிழ்நாடு தமில்நாடு TAMILNADU

RAJA PANNIE SELVAM

CHENNAI

FG 198403

K. Saravanan

K. SARAVANAN, M.Con

STAMP VENDOR

Lic No 1090 / B4 / CH(C)2021- 5

BEFORE THE NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA (NIXI)

IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION BETWEEN

GATX Corporation

...Complainant

Versus

Martins Lewis

...Respondent

IN RESPECT OF DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME:

< gaxt.in >

INDRP Case No.: 2111

ARBITRATION AWARD

BEFORE THE NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA (NIXI)

IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION BETWEEN

GATX Corporation

233 South Wacker Drive,
Chicago, Illinois 60606,
United States of America

...Complainant

Versus

Martins Lewis

5711 W Century Blvd,
Los Angeles 90045
United States of America

...Respondent

IN RESPECT OF DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME:

< gaxt.in >

**INDRP Case No.: 2111
ARBITRATION AWARD**

Date: May 13, 2026

Venue: Chennai

**Raja Pannir Selvam
Sole Arbitrator**

INDEX

S. No.	Particulars	Page No.
A.	The Parties and their Representatives	3
B.	The Domain Name and Registrar	3
C.	Procedural History	3
D.	Complainant's Contentions	4
E.	Respondent's Contention	5
F.	Discussion and Findings	6
G.	Decision	8

1. THE PARTIES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

1. Complainant

GATX Corporation
233 South Wacker Drive,
Chicago, Illinois 60606,
United States of America

Authorized Representative:

Lall & Sethi
D-17, South Extension – II,
New Delhi – 110049
Telephone: +91-11-4289-9999
Fax: +91-11-4289- 9900
Email: tmalik@indiaip.com
rkatyal@indiaip.com

2. Respondent

Martins Lewis
5711 W Century Blvd,
Los Angeles 90045,
United States of America
Email: mohana@glasswing.in

2. THE DOMAIN NAME AND REGISTRAR

The disputed domain name <**gaxt.in**> is registered through the Registrar Namecheap, Inc. (IANA ID: 1068), which is accredited by the .IN Registry (NIXI). The WHOIS details provided by NIXI identify the Respondent as the registrant of the disputed domain name.

3. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

- i. The Complainant filed the present Complaint under the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) in respect of the disputed domain name <gaxt.in> on April 7, 2026.
- ii. The National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI) appointed Mr. Raja Pannir Selvam as the Sole Arbitrator in the present matter on April 14, 2026, and the matter was formally handed over to the undersigned on the same date.
- iii. Upon entering reference, the Sole Arbitrator issued a Notice to the Respondent under Rule 5(c) of the INDRP Rules of Procedure on April 14, 2026, directing the Complainant to serve a complete copy of the Complaint along with all annexures upon the Respondent and to furnish proof of service.
- iv. In compliance with the directions of the Tribunal, the Complainant served the Complaint along with annexures upon the Respondent by electronic mail on April 14, 2026, at the email address reflected in the WHOIS records, and also dispatched a

physical copy of the Complaint along with annexures to the Respondent by courier on April 15, 2026 which was delivered on April 17, 2026. The Complainant thereafter filed proof of service before the Tribunal.

- v. The Respondent was granted time to file its Reply to the Complaint within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of receipt of this Notice. Despite valid service of notice and expiry of the prescribed timeline, the Respondent failed to file any Reply or make any submission in the present proceedings.
- vi. In view of the Respondent's failure to appear or contest the proceedings, the Tribunal proceeded to adjudicate the matter ex-parte, on the basis of the pleadings and material available on record, in accordance with the INDRP Policy and Rules of Procedure.

4. COMPLAINANT'S CONTENTIONS

It is contended by the Complainant that:

- i. The Complainant was founded in 1898 and leases transportation assets and provides critical services to customers worldwide. The Complainant is a world leader in providing railcar leasing and service to customers in North America, Europe and India
- ii. The Complainant expanded to India in 2012 through its subsidiary, GATX India Pvt. Ltd., and began operations as the first private company registered to lease railcars under the Indian Railways Wagon Leasing Scheme.
- iii. The Complainant uses the trademark GATX in connection with a wide variety of goods and services and has been using the said mark for several decades.
- iv. The Complainant is the registered proprietor of the trademark GATX in India, with registrations dating back to April 07, 1998, which are valid and subsisting.
- v. The Complainant is also the owner of domain names <gatx.com> and <gatx.in>, which were registered and used prior to the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.
- vi. The disputed domain name <gaxt.in> is a "typosite" mimicking the Complainant's brand and constitutes domain mimicry by interchanging the last two letters of the Complainant's mark.
- vii. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and there exists no relationship, license, permission, or authorization from the Complainant for use of the GATX mark.
- viii. The disputed domain name is being used to commit fraud by way of domain mimicry of the Complainant's brand.
- ix. On November 24, 2025, and November 25, 2025, Briskworld Ventures Private Limited received emails from an individual purportedly named Manish Arora, who claimed to be an employee of "GATX India," the Complainant's subsidiary. The said emails were sent using the disputed domain name, including manish.kumararora@gaxt.in, impersonating an actual employee of the Complainant, and copying IndiaFinance@gaxt.in and SalesIndia@gaxt.in, impersonating the Complainant's finance and sales departments.

- x. The emails used the Complainant's subsidiary's name, address, and phone number in the signature block and attempted to redirect payments from Briskworld away from the Complainant to the Respondent.
- xi. The Respondent attached a genuine invoice from the Complainant, which had been sent by the Complainant to Briskworld on November 1, 2025, and which is believed to have been improperly obtained from Briskworld's IT systems for use in the fraudulent scheme.
- xii. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with an operational website and its use was solely for the purpose of fraud.
- xiii. Upon becoming aware of the Respondent's fraudulent activities, the Complainant made a formal complaint to the Registrar, Namecheap, requesting suspension of the disputed domain name and disabling of all associated email capabilities.
- xiv. The Registrar suspended and repossessed the disputed domain name and the WHOIS status was changed to "clientHold" and "serverHold."
- xv. The registration and use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith and intended to impersonate the Complainant and commit fraud.

5. RESPONDENT'S CONTENTION

Despite service of the Arbitration Notice dated April 14, 2026, the Respondent has failed to file any Reply or Detailed Statement to the Complaint within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of receipt of notice.

Pursuant to the directions of the Sole Arbitrator, the Complainant thereafter served a copy of the Complaint along with all supporting annexures upon the Respondent by email on April 14, 2026, at the email address reflected in the WHOIS records.

In addition, the Complainant also dispatched a physical copy of the Complaint along with annexures to the Respondent by courier on April 15, 2026. The courier tracking records placed on record show that the said physical copy was successfully delivered to the Respondent on April 17, 2026.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and despite having received the Arbitration Notice as well as both the electronic and physical copies of the Complaint and annexures, the Respondent has not submitted a response.

Accordingly, the Respondent was afforded sufficient opportunity to present its case but has chosen not to do so.

In view of the absence of any reply from the Respondent, the present proceedings are conducted ex-parte. However, even in an uncontested matter, the Complainant must stand on its own merits and is required to establish each of the three elements as prescribed under Clause 4 of the INDRP Policy. No adverse inference can be drawn merely on account of the Respondent's non-appearance.

The disputed domain name <gaxt.in> is registered in the name of the Respondent on November 24, 2025. On the record, there is **no evidence to suggest any bona fide or legitimate use** of the domain name by the Respondent, whether for commercial, non-commercial, or fair purposes. The material before the Tribunal, including an extract of the current landing page of the domain, indicates that the domain is either inactive or used in a manner inconsistent with any legitimate business or personal interest of the Respondent. There is no material on record to show any bona fide use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent.

6. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

The Complainant relies upon Paragraph 4 of the INDRP Policy and is required to establish that:

- a) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

The Tribunal has examined the Complaint, documents on record, and the legal submissions advanced by the Complainant, including reliance placed on prior INDRP decisions and judicial precedents, and proceeds to record its findings under each of the three heads set out in Paragraph 4 of the INDRP Policy.

The findings recorded hereinafter are based on an assessment of the facts pleaded, the evidence placed on record, and the settled principles governing domain name disputes under the INDRP and are not based merely on the non-appearance of the Respondent.

The Tribunal now proceeds to examine, in detail, whether the Complainant has satisfied the requirements under Paragraph 4(a) of the INDRP Policy.

a) Identical or Confusingly Similar

- i. The disputed domain name is virtually identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark GATX and its domain name <gatx.in>, differing only by the interchanging of the letters "T" and "X". Such a minor typographical alteration does not change the overall visual, phonetic, or conceptual impression of the Complainant's mark and does not reduce the likelihood of confusion.
- ii. The swapping of the letters "TX" for "XT" constitutes a cosmetic change, which does not alter the commercial impression of the mark and is likely to mislead users into believing that the disputed domain name is associated with or endorsed by the Complainant.
- iii. It is well settled that such minor alterations, including the shuffling or inversion of letters, constitute typosquatting, and result in domain names that are confusingly similar to the relevant trademark.

- iv. The Complainant has established prior rights in the trademark GATX, including registrations in India and use of domain names <gatx.com> and <gatx.in>, which predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

Hence, the Complainant has succeeded in establishing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark GATX and the Complainant has successfully met the first requirement set out under Clause 4(a)(i) of the INDRP Policy.

b) Rights or Legitimate Interests

- i. It is noted that the Complainant's trademark GATX has been in use for a considerable period of time and is well recognized. In such circumstances, there can be no plausible justification for the adoption or use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent.
- ii. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant had established rights in the GATX mark through extensive use and registration and cannot claim any rights superior to that of the Complainant.
- iii. There exists no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent that would give rise to any license, permission, or authorization for use of the Complainant's trademark.
- iv. There is no material on record to indicate that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the mark GATX.
- v. The Respondent is not making any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.
- vi. On the contrary, the material on record indicates that the disputed domain name has been registered and used solely for the purpose of impersonating the Complainant and perpetrating fraud, including impersonation of the Complainant's employee and attempting to redirect payments from a third party.
- vii. Such use is clearly intended to deceive members of the trade and public and to take unfair advantage of the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's mark.
- viii. The Complainant has thus established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The burden therefore shifts to the Respondent to rebut the same.
- ix. Despite being afforded an opportunity, the Respondent has failed to file any response or provide any evidence to establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In view of the above, the Complainant has satisfied the requirements set out under Clause 4(a)(ii) of the INDRP Policy.

c) Registration and Use in Bad Faith

- i. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, which in itself is indicative of bad faith.
- ii. The material on record shows that within a short time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent impersonated the Complainant's employee, namely

- Manish Arora, and attempted to fraudulently obtain payments from at least one business entity in India. Registration of a domain name in an attempt to appear associated or affiliated with another entity to obtain money constitutes bad faith registration and use.
- iii. The evidence on record demonstrates a clear pattern of fraudulent conduct, including impersonation of a legitimate employee, misuse of genuine invoices, and attempts to redirect payments. Such acts go beyond mere domain name registration and constitute deliberate deception aimed at financial gain, thereby strongly evidencing bad faith under Clause 4(b) of the INDRP Policy.
 - iv. The Respondent had both constructive and actual notice of the Complainant's GATX Mark by virtue of its registrations in India and internationally. Given the Complainant's established presence in India and the Respondent's targeting of an Indian entity, it is reasonable to conclude that the Respondent had actual or, at the very least, constructive knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and business operations.
 - v. It is well settled that typo squatting constitutes evidence of bad faith registration. The use of a domain name that is a typographical variation of a well-known mark creates a likelihood of confusion and demonstrates intent to attract internet users for illegitimate commercial gain.
 - vi. The Complainant has relied upon judicial precedents including *Yahoo! Inc. v. Akash Arora & Anr.*, wherein it was held that a deceptively similar domain name may lead to confusion and misrepresentation. Similarly, in *Colgate Palmolive (India) Ltd. v. Zhaxia (INDRP/887)*, it was observed that such registration attempts to attract internet users by creating confusion with the Complainant's mark.
 - vii. Further, registration of a well-known trademark by a party with no connection or authorization from the trademark owner, and without any legitimate purpose, is indicative of bad faith.
 - viii. The Complainant has also relied upon the judgment in *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd.*, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court recognized that domain names serve as business identifiers and that use of similar domain names may lead to diversion of users and confusion, thereby causing loss to the rightful owner.
 - ix. The material on record demonstrates that the Respondent's activities amount to a bad faith usurpation of the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's GATX Mark for unlawful financial gain, in violation of applicable trademark and unfair competition principles.
 - x. The Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, affiliation, or endorsement, thereby satisfying the conditions of bad faith under the INDRP Policy.

In view of the above, the Tribunal is satisfied that the Complainant has met the requirements set out under Clause 4(a)(iii) of the INDRP Policy, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

7. DECISION

In view of the foregoing findings, namely that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith, the Complaint is allowed.

The National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI) is directed to transfer the domain name <gaxt.in> to the Complainant, GATX Corporation.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Place: Chennai

Date: May 13, 2026

Raja Pannir Selvam
Sole Arbitrator