



INDIA NON JUDICIAL



IN-UP94712688669086X

Government of Uttar Pradesh

e-Stamp

सत्यमेव जयते

Certificate No.	: IN-UP94712688669086X	₹100
Certificate Issued Date	: 12-Feb-2025 03:48 PM	
Account Reference	: NEWIMPACC (SV)/ up14017404/ GAUTAMBUDDH NAGAR 1/ UP-GBN	
Unique Doc. Reference	: SUBIN-UPUP1401740486603924671674X	
Purchased by	: RODNEY DAVID RYDER	
Description of Document	: Article 12 Award	
Property Description	: Not Applicable	
Consideration Price (Rs.)	:	
First Party	: RODNEY DAVID RYDER	
Second Party	: OTHERS	
Stamp Duty Paid By	: RODNEY DAVID RYDER	
Stamp Duty Amount(Rs.)	: 100 (One Hundred only)	

Signature
 Acc Name- ANMOL MISHRA
 Acc Code: UPI4017404 Acc DD Sec-33
 Mob. 7703904514
 LIC No 191, Noida G.B. Nagar

सत्यमेव जयते



Please write or type below this line

IN-UP94712688669086X

**INDRP ARBITRATION
 THE NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA [NIXI]
 ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
 SOLE ARBITRATOR: RODNEY D. RYDER**

Mahindra & Mahindra Limited

v.

Avneet Setia

**INDRP CASE NUMBER - 1914
 ARBITRATION AWARD**

Disputed Domain Name: www.tharroxx.in

Statutory Alert:

1. The authenticity of this Stamp certificate should be verified at www.shciestamp.com/ or using e-Stamp Mobile App of Stock Holding. Any discrepancy in the details on this Certificate and as available on the website / Mobile App renders it invalid.
2. The onus of checking the legitimacy is on the users of the certificate
3. In case of any discrepancy please inform the Competent Authority

The Parties

The Complainant in this arbitration proceeding is Mahindra & Mahindra Limited, having its office at Gateway Building Apollo Bunder, Mumbai - 400001, represented by Saikrishna & Associates.

The Respondent in this arbitration proceeding is Avneet Setia as per the details given by the Whois database maintained by the National Internet Exchange of India [NIXI].

The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name is www.tharroxx.in. The said domain name is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

Details of the disputed domain name

The dispute concerns the domain name www.tharroxx.in. The said domain name was registered on June 12, 2006. The particulars of the said domain name are as follows:

Registrant Organization: Avneet Setia
Registrant Address: House no. 27, Sector 20 A, Chandigarh- 160020, India
Registrant Email: avneetsingh2720@gmail.com


Procedural History [Arbitration Proceedings]

This arbitration proceeding is in accordance with the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy [INDRP] and the INDRP Rules of Procedure [the Rules], adopted by the National Internet Exchange of India. The Rules were approved by NIXI on 28th June 2005 in accordance with the Indian Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. By registering the disputed domain name with a NIXI accredited Registrar, the Respondent agreed to the resolution of the disputes pursuant to the .IN Dispute Resolution Policy and Rules framed thereunder.

According to the information provided by the National Internet Exchange of India ["NIXI"], the history of this proceeding is as follows:

In accordance with Rule 2(a), NIXI formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and appointed Rodney D. Ryder as the Sole Arbitrator for adjudicating upon the dispute in accordance with the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, and the Rules framed thereunder, .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy and the Rules framed thereunder. The Arbitrator submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by NIXI.

In this matter, the arbitration proceedings commenced on January 21, 2025. A copy of the complaint with the annexures was sent to the Respondent by NIXI through an e-mail dated January 21, 2025. Thereafter, the Panel sent an e-mail dated January 21, 2025, to the Respondent requesting for submission of a response to the complaint by February 7, 2025. Thereafter, the Respondent sent an e-mail dated January 21, 2025 with a copy their legal representatives, requesting that they be copied in all future communications. However, no



further communication was received by any of the parties. Specifically, the Respondent did not submit any response other than the above request during the entire duration of the proceedings.

Grounds for the administrative proceedings

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant[s] has statutory/common law rights.
2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.
3. The disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

Parties Contentions

Complainant

The Complainant, Mahindra & Mahindra Limited [Hereinafter referred to as 'Complainant'] in their complaint, inter alia, contended as follows:

The Respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name, trademark or service in which the Complainant has rights.


The Complainant, based on the business, common law rights and trademark registrations for the trademark 'THAR' and related variations, and based on the use of the said trademark in India and other countries, submitted that they are the lawful owner of the trademark 'THAR'. The Complainant further contends by priority in adoption and application, continuous and extensive use, advertising, accruing thereto in the course of trade, that they are also the lawful owner of the mark 'THAR ROXX' [the trademark application for which is pending registration at the time of this award].

The Complainant submits that as the disputed domain name is 'www.tharroxx.in', the disputed domain name is clearly identical/confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark in which the Complainant has exclusive rights and legitimate interest.

Background of the Complainant and its statutory and common law rights Adoption:

The Complainant, Mahindra & Mahindra Limited, is an Indian vehicle manufacturing corporation and part of the Mahindra Group, a multinational conglomerate incorporated in 1945. The Mahindra Group has a presence in more than 100 countries and employs over 2,50,000 people in over 150 companies. The Mahindra Group operates in 22 key industries, including but not limited to, the automotive and Agri industries.

The Complainant's portfolio includes SUVs, UVs, sedans, pick-ups, light, medium and heavy commercial vehicles, and three-wheelers. The Complainant is also the leading tractor company by volume in the world. The Automotive and Farm Equipment Business is the largest contributor to the Mahindra Group's revenue with it being present in 20 locations and an ecosystem of 1,200 suppliers and 3,500 dealers.



On October 4, 2010, the Complainant launched a unique model in the Compact off-road 4x4 SUV range in India under the distinct brand 'THAR'. Within a short period since its launch, the Complainant has sold several lakh vehicles under the 'THAR' brand in India and also exported a large number to various countries across the world. The Complainant has also time and again, launched new variants of the 'THAR' vehicles.

On August 15, 2024, the Complainant launched an SUV under the brand name "THAR ROXX" marking a significant milestone in the company's SUV lineup. The Complainant avers to have engaged in extensive promotion and advertisement of its "THAR ROXX" SUV, even prior to its launch.

The Complainant has several websites/domains containing the mark 'THAR', including but not limited to <www.mahindrathar.com>.

Statutory rights:

The Complainant has registrations for the different variations of the mark 'THAR' and the logo associated with it in India and other countries. The mark is registered under classes 9, 12, 35, 41, and 42 in India.

Respondent


The Respondent sent an e-mail to the Panel dated January 21, 2025, requesting that its legal representatives be copied in all future communications. However, the Respondent subsequently failed to reply to the notice regarding the complaint within the stipulated time period.

Discussion and Findings

The Respondent does not have any relationship with the business of the Complainant or any legitimate interest in the mark/brand 'THAR'. Moreover, the Complainant has neither given any license nor authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's mark. The Respondent has never been commonly known by the domain name in question and registered the domain name on July 20, 2024, that is subsequent to the Complainant's usage of the trademark 'THAR' and brand name 'THAR ROXX'.

The complainant's trademark 'THAR' and brand name 'THAR ROXX' are contended to be extremely popular in India and other countries. The Complainant has valid and subsisting trademark registrations for the mark 'THAR' in India and other countries, as well as priority of use and application of the brand 'THAR ROXX'.

The disputed domain name contains the entirety of the Complainant's trademark 'THAR' and the brand name 'THAR ROXX'. Furthermore, the addition of the top-level domain ".in" is irrelevant in determining whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. It is well established that the specific top-level domain, such as ".com",



".net", ".in", ".co.in", ".org.in" etc. does not affect the domain name for the purpose of determining whether it is identical or confusingly similar [Relevant Decisions: *Magnum Piering, Inc. v. The Mudjackers and Garwood S. Wilson, Sr.*, WIPO Case No. D2000-1525; *Rollerblade, Inc. v. Chris McCrady*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0429; *Aon PLC and Ors. v. Guanrui*, INDRP/633].

It is a well-established principle that once the Complainant makes a prima facie case showing that a Respondent lacks the rights to the domain name at issue, the Respondent must come forward with the proof that it has some legitimate interest in the domain name to rebut this presumption.

The Respondent's Default

The INDRP Rules of Procedure require under Rule 13(b) that the arbitrator must ensure that each party is given a fair opportunity to present its case. Rule 13(b) reads as follows

"The Arbitrator shall at all times treat the Parties with equality and provide each one of them with a fair opportunity to present their case."

Rule 17 empowers the Arbitrator to proceed with an ex parte decision in case any party does not comply with the time limits or fails to reply against the complaint. Rule 17 reads as follows:

"In event any party breaches the provisions of INDRP rules and/or directions of the Arbitrator, the matter can be decided ex-parte by the Arbitrator and such arbitral award shall be binding in accordance to law."

The Respondent was given notice of this administrative proceeding in accordance with the Rules. The .IN Registry discharged its responsibility under Rule 2(a) to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent of the Complaint.


As previously indicated, the Respondent failed to file any reply to the Complaint and has not sought to answer the Complainant's assertions, evidence or contentions in any manner. The Panel finds that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present his case.

The 'Rules' under paragraph 13(a) provides that the Arbitrator shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the INDRP and any law that the Arbitrator deems fit to be applicable. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 17, the Arbitrator may draw such inferences as are appropriate from the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's assertions and evidence or to otherwise contest the Complaint. In the circumstances, the Arbitrator's / Panel's decision is based upon the Complainant's assertions and evidence and inferences drawn from the Respondent's failure to reply.

The issues involved in the dispute

The Complainant in their complaint have invoked paragraph 4 of the INDRP which reads:

"Types of Disputes –



Any Person who considers that a registered domain name conflicts with his/her 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 in which the Complainant has rights; and*
- (b) the Registrant 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 or for illegal/unlawful purpose."*

According to paragraph 4 of the INDRP, there are 3 essential elements of a domain name dispute which are being discussed hereunder in light of the facts and circumstances of this case.

The Registrant's domain name is identical and/or confusingly similar to a name, trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

It has been proved by the Complainant that they have intellectual property, particularly trademark rights and other rights in the mark 'THAR' by submitting substantial documents. The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's registered trademark 'THAR' and brand name 'THAR ROXX' in its entirety.

Apart from trademark registrations, the Complainant has submitted the domain name[s] owned by it containing the mark 'THAR'. The Complainant's official website under the 'THAR' mark is <www.mahindrathar.com>.

It has been previously decided under the INDRP that incorporating a trademark in its entirety is sufficient to establish the identical and confusingly similar nature of the disputed domain name.


According to paragraph 3 of the INDRP, it is the responsibility of the Respondent to find out before registration that the domain name he is going to register does not violate the rights of any proprietor/brand owner.

Paragraph 3 of the INDRP is reproduced below:

"The Registrant's Representations -

By applying to register a domain name, or by asking a Registrar to maintain or renew a domain name registration, the Registrant hereby represents and warrants that:

- (a) the credentials furnished by the Registrant for registration of Domain Name are complete and accurate;*
- (b) to the knowledge of registrant, the registration of the domain name will not infringe upon or otherwise violate the rights of any third party;*
- (c) the Registrant is not registering the domain name for an unlawful and malafide purpose; and*



(d) the Registrant will not knowingly use the domain name in violation or abuse of any applicable laws or regulations. It is the sole responsibility of the Registrant to determine whether their domain name registration infringes or violates someone else's rights."

The Respondent has failed in its responsibility discussed above and in the light of the pleadings and documents filed by the Complainant; the Panel has come to the conclusion that the disputed domain name is identical with or deceptively similar to the Complainant's trademark 'THAR' and brand name 'THAR ROXX'. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the first element required by Paragraph 4 of the INDRP. [Relevant Decisions: *Magnum Piering, Inc. v. The Mudjackers and Garwood S. Wilson, Sr.*, WIPO Case No. D2000-1525; *Aon PLC and Ors. v. Gangadhar Mahesh*, INDRP/632; *Wells Fargo & Co. and Anr. v. DeepDas Kumar*, INDRP/628; *Natures Basket Limited & Ors. v. Dipti Singla*, INDRP/683; *General Motors India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. v. Anish Sharma*, INDRP/799; *Havells India Limited and Anr. v. Whois Foundation*, WIPO Case No. D2016-1775; *Santa Fe Transport International Limited and Santa Fe Moving Services Private Limited v. Santa fe Packers, Packers Movers* WIPO Case No. D2017-0754; *Santa Fe Transport International Limited and Santa Fe Moving Services Private Limited v. Achyut Khare*, INDRP/886; *TransferWise Ltd. vs. Normand Clavet*, INDRP/1150; *Instagram, LLC v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Edmunds Gaidis*, WIPO Case No. D2021-0401; *Royal Multisport Private Limited. v. Deepak Jawade*, WIPO Case No. D2023-0048; *Nike Innovative C.V. v. Amy Hill*, INDRP/1288]


The Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name

The second element that the Complainant needs to prove and as is required by paragraph 4(b) of the INDRP is that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has never assigned, granted or in any way authorised the Respondent to register or use the 'THAR' trademark, brand name 'THAR ROXX' or any other related mark. The Complainant has been using the 'THAR' and 'THAR ROXX' marks for a *bonafide* purpose in relation to its business for several years.

Moreover, the burden of proof on the Complainant regarding this element of the domain name dispute lies most directly within the Respondent's knowledge. Once the Complainant has made a *prima facie* case showing that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the domain name, the evidentiary burden shifts to the Respondent to rebut the contention by providing evidence of its rights or interests in the domain name.

The Respondent has not rebutted the contentions of the Complainant and has not produced any documents or submissions to show his interest in protecting his own right and interest in the domain name.



Further, the Respondent has used the domain name to display a parking page with links leading to the websites of the Complainant and third parties engaged in the automobile industry. The Complainant contends that these are pay-per-click links and through these, the Respondent generates revenue for each click on the shown advertisements generated by Internet users visiting said page built on the disputed domain name. Hence, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered bona fide or legitimate since this practice violates the Complainant's rights in its trademark 'THAR' and prior adopted brand name 'THAR ROXX'. This clearly establishes that the Respondent is attempting to encash on the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant and their mark 'THAR' and brand 'THAR ROXX'.


The Respondent has no rights over the 'THAR' mark and prior adopted brand name 'THAR ROXX' used in the disputed domain name and has not made any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain. The Respondent is thus misleading consumers by using the Complainant's mark 'THAR' and brand name 'THAR ROXX' in the disputed domain name.

In addition to this, the very fact that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent subsequent to the Complainant's use of the mark 'THAR' and brand name 'THAR ROXX' clearly establishes that the Respondent must have registered the domain name to cash-in on the popularity of the Complainant's brand. Additionally, the fact that the Respondent has not submitted any response in its defence, as well as the fact that the WHOIS details provided by the Respondent are either incomplete or incorrect indicates, under the present circumstances, the lack of rights and legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. [Relevant Decisions: *Aon PLC and Ors. v. Guanrui*, INDRP/633; *Wells Fargo & Co. and Anr. v. SreeDas Kumar*, INDRP/666; *QRG Enterprises Limited & Anr. v. Zhang Mi*, INDRP/852; *Santa Fe Transport International Limited and Santa Fe Moving Services Private Limited v. Santa fe Packers, Packers Movers* WIPO Case No. D2017-0754; *Havells India Limited and Anr. v. Whois Foundation*, WIPO Case No. D2016-1775; *Mahendra Singh Dhoni and Anr. v. David Hanley*, WIPO Case No. D2016-1692; *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. WhoisGuard, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2018-2495; *Aditya Birla Management Corp v Chinmay*, INDRP/1197; *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003].

The Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

It has been contended by the Complainant that the Respondent has registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The language of the INDRP paragraph 4(c) is clear enough and requires that either bad faith registration or bad faith use be proved.



Paragraph 7 of the INDRP provides that the following circumstances are deemed to be evidence that a Respondent has registered and used a domain name in bad faith:


“For the purposes of Clause 4(c), the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Arbitrator to be present, shall be evidence of the Registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (a) Circumstances indicating that 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; or*
- (b) the Registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the Trademark or Service Mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the Registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or*
- (c) by using the domain name, the Registrant has intentionally attempted 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.; or*
- (d) The Registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor.”*

From the circumstances of the case and from the evidences put before the Panel by the Complainant, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent had no previous connection with the disputed domain name or the mark ‘THAR’ or brand name ‘THAR ROXX’ and any use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, would result in confusion and deception of the trade, consumers and public, who would assume a connection or association between the Complainant and the Respondent’s website or other online locations of the Respondent or links to the product/services on the Respondent’s website and otherwise, due to the use by Respondent of the Complainant’s trademark ‘THAR’ and brand name ‘THAR ROXX’ in the disputed domain name, which trademark has been widely used by the Complainant and which trademark is associated exclusively with the Complainant.

The Panel is prepared to accept the Complainant’s contention that its trademark ‘THAR’ and the prior use brand name ‘THAR ROXX’ are famous. With regard to famous names, successive UDRP panels have found bad faith registration because the Complainant’s name was famous at the time of registration: *WIPO/D2000-0310 [choyongpil.net]*.

Based on the submissions and evidences put forth before the Panel, the Panel is of the belief that the Respondent would have definitely known about the Complainant’s brands ‘THAR’ and ‘THAR ROXX’, and their reputation at the time of registering the disputed domain name.



The domain name is deceptively similar to the marks of the Complainant and will lead to confusion with the Complainant's trademark 'THAR' and the prior use brand name 'THAR ROXX' as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's business by the Complainant. Moreover, the portrayal of an association with the Complainant's brand is in view of the Panel, constituent of bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

The fact that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent subsequent to the Complainant's use of the mark 'THAR' and 'THAR ROXX' makes it apparent that the Respondent must have registered the domain name to cash in on the popularity of the Complainant's 'THAR' and 'THAR ROXX' brands. Additionally, the fact that the Respondent has not submitted any response in its defence as well as the fact that the WHOIS details provided by the Respondent are either incomplete or incorrect, are both indicators of bad faith under the present circumstances.

On bad faith registration and use [generally], panels have noted: "Registration of a well-known trademark by a party with no connection to the owner of the trademark and no authorization and no legitimate purpose to utilize the mark reveals bad faith": *NAF/FA95314 [thecaravanclub.com]*, *WIPO/D2000-0808* [very use of domain name by Respondent who had no connection whatsoever with Complainant's mark and product suggests opportunistic bad faith - *4icq.com*]; "Registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar or identical to a famous trademark....is itself sufficient evidence of bad faith registration and use" [*Wells Fargo & Co. and Anr. v. Krishna Reddy, INDRP/581; QRG Enterprises Limited & Anr. v. Zhang Mi, INDRP/852*]; "In any event, it is well established that registration of a well-known trade mark as a domain name is itself likely to give rise to a finding of bad faith": *Signify Holding B.V. v. Private Registration / Tomas Baran, WIPO Case No. D2019-3135*].


Thus, all three conditions given in paragraph 7 of the INDRP are proved in the circumstances of this case and thus the registration of the impugned domain name by the Respondent/Registrant is a registration in bad faith.

Decision

The Respondent has failed to comply with Para 3 of the INDRP which requires that it is the responsibility of the Respondent to ensure before the registration of the impugned domain name by him that the domain name registration does not infringe or violate someone else's rights.

The Complainant has given sufficient evidence to prove extensive trademark rights over the disputed domain name. Further, the Respondent's adoption and registration of the disputed domain name is dishonest and malafide.


While the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, panels have recognized that this could result in the often-impossible task of proving a negative, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge of the Respondent. Therefore, the Complainant is



required to make out a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a *prima facie* case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. In this case, the Respondent did not file any response in its defense. Based on the facts of the case, it is apparent that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith and has registered the domain name to cash in on the reputation of the Complainant's mark and to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name.

[Relevant Decisions: *Lego Juris AS v. Robert Martin* INDRP/125; *Societe Air France v. DNS Admin* INDRP/075; *Kelemata SPA v. Mr Bassarab Dungaciu* WIPO D2003-0849; *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.* WIPO D2003-0455; *Uniroyal Engineered Products, Inc. v. Nauga Network Services* WIPO D2000-0503; *Microsoft Corporation v. Chun Man Kam* INDRP/119; *AB Electrolux v. Liheng*, INDRP/700; *Equitas Holding Limited v. Sivadas K P*, INDRP/724; *BearingPoint IP Holdings B.V. v. Deborah R. Heacock*, INDRP/822; *Dell Inc. v. Jack Sun*, INDRP/312; *HID Global Corporation v. Zhaxia*, INDRP/652; *McDonald's Corporation v. Ravinder*, INDRP/746; *MontBlanc-Simplo G.M.B.H. v. M S Mohamed Salihu*, INDRP/678; *Orica Australia Proprietary Limited v. Bev Gran, D N Solutions*, INDRP/237; *Sopra Steria Group v. Xu Xiantao*, INDRP/796; *Panasonic Corporation v. Sun Wei*, INDRP/527; *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Machang*, INDRP/539; *PJS International S.A. v. Xiangwang*, INDRP/616; *Aon PLC and Ors. v. Gangadhar Mahesh*, INDRP/632; *Aon PLC and Ors. v. Guanrui*, INDRP/633; *Wells Fargo & Co. and Anr. v. Krishna Reddy*, INDRP/581; *Wells Fargo & Co. and Anr. v. SreeDas Kumar*, INDRP/666; *Wells Fargo & Co. and Anr. v. DeepDas Kumar*, INDRP/628; *Natures Basket Limited & Ors. v. Dipti Singla*, INDRP/683; *General Motors India Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. v. Anish Sharma*, INDRP/799; *QRG Enterprises Limited & Anr. v. Zhang Mi*, INDRP/852; *Santa Fe Transport International Limited and Santa Fe Moving Services Private Limited v. Santa fe Packers, Packers Movers* WIPO Case No. D2017-0754; *Santa Fe Transport International Limited and Santa Fe Moving Services Private Limited v. Achyut Khare*, INDRP/886]

The Respondent's registration and use of the domain name [www.tharroxx.in] is abusive and in bad faith. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name. In accordance with Policy and Rules, the Panel directs that the disputed domain name [www.tharroxx.in] be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant; with a request to NIXI to monitor the transfer.



Rodney D. Ryder
Sole Arbitrator
Date: February 12, 2025