



தமிழ்நாடு தமில்நாடு TAMILNADU

FG 198404

RAJA PANNAR SELVAM  
CHENNAI

*K. Saravanan*  
K. SARAVANAN, M.Com  
STAMP VENDOR  
Lic No 1090 / B4 / CH(C)2021- 5



BEFORE THE NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA (NIXI)

IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION BETWEEN

Bloomberg Finance L.P.

...Complainant

Versus

Rakesh GS

...Respondent

IN RESPECT OF DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME:

< bloomberghr.in >

INDRP Case No.: 2131

ARBITRATION AWARD

*A. S. Chandra*

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA (NIXI)**

**IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION BETWEEN**

**Bloomberg Finance L.P.**

731 Lexington Ave.,  
New York, New York 10022,  
United States of America

...Complainant

**Versus**

**Rakesh GS**

Bloomberg HR Consulting Services Private Limited  
NO #191, Manjunatha Layout, Munnekola, Bangalore,  
Karnataka - 560037, India.

...Respondent

**IN RESPECT OF DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME:**

< bloomberghr.in >

**INDRP Case No.: 2131**

**ARBITRATION AWARD**

**Date:** June 16, 2026

**Venue:** Chennai



---

**Raja Pannir Selvam**  
**Sole Arbitrator**



**INDEX**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Particulars</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
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	9



## 1. THE PARTIES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

### 1. Complainant

Bloomberg Finance L.P.  
731 Lexington Ave.,  
New York, New York 10022,  
United States of America

#### Authorized Representative:

Sudarshana Sen-Mitra,  
D. P. Ahuja & Co.,  
14/2 Palm Avenue, Kolkata - 700 019  
Telephone: (033) 4017 7100  
Email: [litigation@dpahuja.in](mailto:litigation@dpahuja.in)

### 2. Respondent

Rakesh GS  
Bloomberg HR Consulting Services Private Limited  
NO #191, Manjunatha Layout,  
Munnekola, Bangalore,  
Karnataka - 560037, India  
Email: [rakeshgs366@gmail.com](mailto:rakeshgs366@gmail.com)

## 2. THE DOMAIN NAME AND REGISTRAR

The disputed domain name <**bloomberghr.in**> is registered through the Registrar Key-Systems GmbH, 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 <bloomberghr.in> on May 21, 2026.
- ii. The National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI) appointed Mr. Raja Pannir Selvam as the Sole Arbitrator in the present matter on May 22, 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 May 22, 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 May 23, 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

*Abdham :-*

May 23, 2026 which was delivered on May 25, 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, Bloomberg Finance L.P., together with its affiliates including Bloomberg L.P., is a multinational financial news corporation and one of the largest providers of global financial news, data, analytics and related goods and services.
- ii. The Complainant was founded in 1981 by Mr. Michael R. Bloomberg and has operated under the name and trademark BLOOMBERG since at least 1987.
- iii. The Complainant has been operating in India since 1996 through its affiliates and group companies including Bloomberg Data Services (India) Private Limited, Bloomberg Television Production Services India Private Limited and Bloomberg Tradebook India Private Limited.
- iv. The Complainant is the registered proprietor of numerous BLOOMBERG trademark registrations in India, including registrations in Classes 9 and 16 dating back to July 26, 1996, which are valid and subsisting.
- v. The Complainant is also the owner of several domain names incorporating its BLOOMBERG mark, including <bloomberg.com>, <bloomberg.net>, <bloomberg.co.in> and <bloomberg.in>, all of which were registered long prior to the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.
- vi. The BLOOMBERG trademark has been recognized as a "Well Known Trademark" by the Indian Trade Marks Registry and has also been declared well known by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in Bloomberg Finance L.P. v. Prafull Saklecha and Ors.
- vii. The disputed domain name <bloomberghr.in> wholly incorporates the Complainant's famous BLOOMBERG trademark together with the descriptive suffix "hr", which is commonly understood as an abbreviation for "human resources".
- viii. The addition of the suffix "hr" does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's mark and instead increases the likelihood that Internet users would believe that the disputed domain name is associated with the human resources department of the Complainant.
- ix. The Respondent incorporated a company under the name "Bloomberg HR Consulting Services Private Limited" on December 22, 2021, and acquired the disputed domain name on December 29, 2021.

*Abdhaman*

- x. The Complainant issued a cease-and-desist notice to the Respondent on February 24, 2022 demanding that the Respondent cease use of the BLOOMBERG name and change its company name.
- xi. The Respondent refused to comply with the Complainant's legitimate demands and expressly declined to change its company name.
- xii. The Complainant thereafter initiated proceedings before the Regional Director, South East Region, Ministry of Corporate Affairs under Section 16 of the Companies Act, 2013.
- xiii. By order dated February 7, 2023, the Regional Director (SE Region) directed the Respondent to change its company name to one which is not identical or similar to the name or trademark of the Complainant within three months from the date of the order.
- xiv. The Respondent failed to comply with the said order and consequently the Registrar of Companies changed the Respondent's company name under Rule 33A of the Companies (Incorporation) Rules, 2013.
- xv. According to information available from the Ministry of Corporate Affairs and investigations conducted on behalf of the Complainant, the Respondent ceased business operations in or about 2023 and vacated its office premises in mid-2024.
- xvi. The disputed domain name presently does not resolve to an active website. However, the Respondent renewed or updated the disputed domain name on January 31, 2026, in the name of "Bloomberg HR Consulting Services Pvt. Ltd." despite such company name no longer existing.
- xvii. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has never been licensed, authorized or permitted to use the BLOOMBERG trademark.
- xviii. The registration and continued holding of the disputed domain name is intended to capitalize upon the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant's well-known BLOOMBERG mark and to create a false impression of association with the Complainant.
- xix. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and for unlawful purposes and ought to be transferred to the Complainant.

## 5. RESPONDENT'S CONTENTION

Despite service of the Arbitration Notice dated May 22, 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 May 23, 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 May 23, 2026. The courier tracking records placed

*Abdhaman*

on record show that the said physical copy was successfully delivered to the Respondent on May 25, 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 <bloomberghr.in> is registered in the name of the Respondent on December 29, 2021. 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.

*Abdhaman :-*

**a) Identical or Confusingly Similar**

- i. The Complainant has established substantial rights in the trademark BLOOMBERG through long-standing use, extensive international reputation and numerous trademark registrations, including registrations in India dating back to 1996.
- ii. The BLOOMBERG trademark has also been recognized as a Well-Known Trademark in India and enjoys a significant reputation amongst consumers and members of trade.
- iii. The disputed domain name <bloomberghr.in> incorporates the Complainant's BLOOMBERG trademark in its entirety.
- iv. The only additional element is the suffix "hr", which is a commonly used and non-distinctive abbreviation for "human resources".
- v. The addition of a descriptive term to a well-known trademark does not dispel confusing similarity. On the contrary, in the present case the suffix "hr" increases the likelihood of confusion by creating the impression that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant's human resources department.
- vi. The country code top-level domain ".in" is a technical requirement of registration and does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark.
- vii. The Tribunal is therefore satisfied that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known BLOOMBERG trademark.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under Clause 4(a)(i) of the INDRP Policy.

**b) Rights or Legitimate Interests**

- i. The Complainant has asserted that it has never licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the BLOOMBERG trademark in any manner whatsoever.
- ii. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any manner and has never been authorized or licensed to use the BLOOMBERG mark.
- iii. The evidence on record demonstrates that the Respondent adopted the name "Bloomberg HR Consulting Services Private Limited" and registered the disputed domain name only in December 2021, many years after the Complainant had acquired substantial rights and reputation in the BLOOMBERG mark.
- iv. The Regional Director, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, upon consideration of the Complainant's application under Section 16 of the Companies Act, 2013, directed the Respondent to change its company name on the ground that it was identical with or too nearly resembled the Complainant's trademark and name.
- v. The Respondent failed to comply with the said order and its company name was subsequently altered by the Registrar of Companies.
- vi. The material on record further indicates that the Respondent company has ceased operations and no longer carries on business under the disputed name.
- vii. The disputed domain name presently does not resolve to an active website and there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services through the disputed domain name.

*Abdhaman :-*

- viii. The Respondent cannot claim any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, particularly when the domain wholly incorporates a well-known trademark of the Complainant.
- ix. The Complainant has therefore established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.
- x. The burden consequently shifted to the Respondent to demonstrate otherwise. Despite being afforded an opportunity, the Respondent has failed to file any response or evidence.

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 BLOOMBERG trademark is distinctive, well known and enjoys substantial reputation worldwide as well as in India.
- ii. The Complainant's trademark registrations and domain name registrations substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name.
- iii. Given the fame and distinctiveness of the BLOOMBERG mark, the Tribunal finds it inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.
- iv. The Respondent deliberately selected a domain name comprising the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the suffix "hr", thereby creating a likelihood of confusion and an impression of affiliation with the Complainant's human resources department.
- v. The Respondent continued to retain and renew the disputed domain name despite receiving notice of the Complainant's rights and despite proceedings before the Ministry of Corporate Affairs resulting in directions against the Respondent.
- vi. The Respondent's refusal to voluntarily cease use of the BLOOMBERG name and its continued retention of the disputed domain name are circumstances supporting a finding of bad faith.
- vii. The issuance of the cease-and-desist notice dated February 24, 2022 placed the Respondent on actual notice of the Complainant's prior and well-established rights in the BLOOMBERG trademark. Despite such notice, the Respondent neither relinquished the disputed domain name nor took any steps to mitigate the likelihood of confusion.
- viii. The evidence on record shows that the disputed domain name was renewed as recently as January 31, 2026, in the name of "Bloomberg HR Consulting Services Pvt. Ltd." notwithstanding that such company name no longer existed. Such continued retention of the disputed domain name after acquiring actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights further reinforces the inference that the disputed domain name has been maintained in bad faith.

*Abdhaman :-*

- ix. The Tribunal is further of the view that the composition of the disputed domain name is such that it is capable of misleading Internet users into believing that it is associated with the Complainant's human resources function.
- x. The passive holding of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark does not prevent a finding of bad faith where the surrounding circumstances indicate targeting of the trademark owner.
- xi. In the facts of the present case, the Respondent's registration and continued holding of the disputed domain name serves no plausible legitimate purpose and constitutes bad faith registration and use within the meaning of 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 <bloomberghr.in> to the Complainant, Bloomberg Finance L.P.

There shall be no order as to costs.

**Place:** Chennai

**Date:** June 16, 2026



---

**Raja Pannir Selvam**  
Sole Arbitrator

