



सत्यमेव जयते

INDIA NON JUDICIAL

Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi

e-Stamp

Certificate No. : IN-DL76769995100861X
Certificate Issued Date : 30-Apr-2025 01:01 PM
Account Reference : IMPACC (SH)/ dlshimp17/ SUPREME COURT/ DL-DLH
Unique Doc. Reference : SUBIN-DLDSLHIMP1792996848874208X
Purchased by : PRAVEEN KUMAR JAIN
Description of Document : Article 12 Award
Property Description : Not Applicable
Consideration Price (Rs.) : 0
 (Zero)
First Party : PRAVEEN KUMAR JAIN
Second Party : Not Applicable
Stamp Duty Paid By : PRAVEEN KUMAR JAIN
Stamp Duty Amount(Rs.) : 100
 (One Hundred only)



Please write or type below this line

BEFORE THE SOLE ARBITRATOR
MR. PRAVEEN KUMAR JAIN, ADVOCATE
INDRP CASE NO. 1984

In the arbitration between:
CitiusTech Healthcare Technology
Private Limited
 and
Marmik Chauhan

...Complaint

...Respondent



Praveen M. Jain

Statutory Alert:

- The authenticity of this Stamp certificate should be verified at www.stockexchangeindia.com using e-Stamp Mobile App of Stock Exchange of India.
- The onus of checking the legitimacy is on the users of the certificate.
- In case of any discrepancy please inform the Competent Authority.

BEFORE THE SOLE ARBITRATOR
MR. PRAVEEN KUMAR JAIN, ADVOCATE
INDRP CASE NO. 1984

In the arbitration between:

CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited

9th–11th Floors, L&T Technology Center IV (TC IV)

Next to L&T Business Park, Off JVLR, Saki Vihar Road

Powai, Mumbai – 400072, Maharashtra, India

Tel: +91 22 6153 6000

Email: rashmi.chendvankar@citiustech.com

...Complaint

and

Marmik Chauhan

Medte

Radhanpur Road, Mahesana – 384002

Gujarat, India

Tel: +91 8238266826

Email: marmikchauhan.learning@gmail.com

...Respondent

ARBITRAL AWARD DATED: 07-06-2025

A. INTRODUCTION:

The above-titled Complaint dated 10-03-2025 has been filed by the Complainant - **CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited** for adjudication of the domain name dispute in accordance with the *.IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy* (hereinafter referred to as "the



Praveen W. J.

Policy), and the *INDRP Rules of Procedure* (hereinafter referred to as "the INDRP Rules") as adopted by the .IN Registry - *National Internet Exchange of India* (hereinafter referred to as "the Registry" for short). The disputed domain name <**citiustech.org.in**> is registered with the Registrar, namely GoDaddy.com. LLC. It was created on **2024-11-30** (YYYY/MM/DD) and is set to expire on **2026-11-30** (YYYY/MM/DD). The disputed domain name is registered by **Marmik Chauhan Medte**, the Respondent herein.

B. PROCEDURAL HISTORY:

Appointment of the sole Arbitrator:

1. *Vide* its email dated 26-03-2025, the Registry sought my consent for appointment as the Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the above-stated domain name dispute between the above-said parties.
2. *Vide* my email dated 29-03-2025, I had furnished to the Registry my digitally signed 'Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality & Independence' dated 29-03-2025 in the format prescribed by the Registry.
3. Thereafter, *vide* email dated 09-04-2025, the Registry informed the parties that the undersigned had been appointed as the Sole Arbitrator to adjudicate the dispute pertaining to the domain name <citiustech.org.in>, and accordingly, the matter was assigned INDRP Case No. 1984. Along with the said communication, the Registry also forwarded the soft copies of the Amended Complaint



Praveen W. J.

dt. 10-03-2025, **Annexures** 1 to 9 and the undersigned's *Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality & Independence*.

Tribunal's Notice to the Parties:

4. *Vide* email dated 10-04-2025, this Tribunal issued a Notice of Arbitration under Rule 5(c) of the INDRP Rules, accompanied by the Statement of Independence and Impartiality in compliance with Section 12 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), read with the Sixth Schedule thereto. As on date, no objections have been raised by either party.

Acknowledgement of Receipt and Respondent's Consent:

5. The Arbitral Tribunal notes that, *vide* email dated 11-04-2025, the Respondent acknowledged receipt of the Complaint and its annexures, as transmitted electronically by the Complainant. In the same communication, the Respondent expressly stated that he had no objection to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.
6. The Respondent has submitted that, in the year 2024, he was exploring the possibility of establishing an independent business venture. During this period, and based on a suggestion generated by an online AI-based name-generation tool, he proceeded to register the disputed domain name.
7. The Respondent has clarified that the domain name in question was never put to active use and was not formally associated with any commercial enterprise or business registration thereafter.



Praveen W. J.

8. The Respondent has further stated that, at the time of registering the disputed domain name, he was unaware of the existence of any identical domain name or similar company name.
9. Following receipt of the Complaint and upon understanding the potential conflict with the Complainant's rights, the Respondent has expressed his willingness to cooperate fully with the arbitral proceedings. He has voluntarily disclosed his identity, confirmed that he had no intention to retain or use the disputed domain name, and has requested that the Tribunal pass appropriate orders in the matter. The Respondent has also conveyed his readiness to provide any further information or assistance as may be required by the Tribunal.

Tribunal's Acknowledgment and Procedural Direction:

10. *Vide* email dated 11-04-2025, the Tribunal acknowledged receipt of the Respondent's communication enclosing a copy of his Aadhaar Card as proof of identity. The Respondent's email dt. 11-04-2025 along with the attached document was duly forwarded to the Complainant and the Registry. In view of this development, the Tribunal directed the Complainant to file its response within three (3) days from the date of receipt of the said email.

Complainant's Reply and Request for Relief:

11. *Vide* email dated 14-04-2025, the Complainant submitted that the said communication may be treated as its formal reply to the



Place W. J.

Respondent's email dated 11-04-2025. Referring to the Respondent's express admission and no-objection statement, the Complainant has requested the Tribunal to order the transfer of the disputed domain name in its favour.

Complainant's Confirmation of Service:

12. *Vide* email dated 15-04-2025, the Complainant further informed the Tribunal that, in compliance with the directions issued *vide* notice dated 10-04-2025, physical copies of the Complaint and annexures were duly served upon the Respondent *via* speed post on 12-04-2025 to the Respondent's contact address as per the WHOIS records associated with the disputed domain name. In addition, soft copies of the Complaint and accompanying documents were transmitted *via* email on 11-04-2025. The Complainant also attached, along with its aforesaid email dated 15-04-2025, proof of service for both the physical and electronic copies of the Complaint.

C. COMPLAINANT'S COMPLAINT:

C.1: STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The Complainant has stated the following facts in its Complaint dated 10-03-2025:

Introduction of the Complainant:

1. The Complainant has stated that it is an Indian Healthcare Technology Private Limited Company and its address for service of summons, notices, etc., from the Tribunal are as shown in the



Praveen W. J.

cause title. The Complainant has further stated that it could be served to its authorised representative, Mr. Vaibhav Vutts, Ms. Anupriya Shyam & Ms. Aarya Deshmukh, Advocates at Vutts & Associates LLP, C-5/8 GF, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi – 110016.

2. The Complainant has stated the complaint is based on the Complainant's corporate name and umbrella trade mark **CITIUSTECH**, hereinafter together referred to as the "**Mark**" or "**Mark CITIUSTECH**". In these proceedings, all references to the Complainant shall include Complainant, its predecessors in interest and title, principals, subsidiaries and affiliates. The complainant is a leading provider of consulting and digital technology to healthcare and life sciences companies.
3. It is further stated that the mark CITIUSTECH is the registered trademark of the Complainant and features in the corporate names of the Complainant. The mark CITIUSTECH is exclusively associated with the Complainant. The Complainant operates in India, the USA, the UK, the UAE and Singapore.
4. It is stated briefly that the Complainant's Mark- CITIUSTECH was first adopted by the Complainant as its brand name and logo in the year 2005 when the company was established with the name Citius IT Solutions Private Limited. This mark is also used as a part of the name of the Complainant's subsidiary company in the USA, CitiusTech, Inc., which was established on 11-07-2005. The



Praveen W. J.

Complainant then changed its own name to CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited on 10-10-2015. However, the integral and conspicuous portion of the Complainant- CITIUSTECH- continues to remain the same. Details of the Complainant's change of name has been enclosed as **Annexure 3**.

5. The Complainant has stated that it has been using the mark CITIUSTECH continuously and exclusively from the date of adoption until now. Since inception, the Mark – CITIUSTECH has featured as the brand name, corporate name and umbrella trade mark of the Complainant and is one of the well-respected business houses in India as well as in USA. CitiusTech is a leading provider of healthcare technology services and solutions. CitiusTech builds applications, deploys enterprise-level software and is a pioneer in healthcare analytics in the international market. CitiusTech is a company well-established in the US market and is expanding its business to other countries. CitiusTech has been funded by various investors/ shareholders including General Atlantic for millions of dollars. The above submissions are supported by internet extracts from Forbes magazine which have been attached as **Annexure 4**.

Demonstrated Brand Strength and Revenue:

6. The Complainant has stated that ever since the adoption of the Mark, it has been used continuously, extensively, and over a long period of time, resulting in substantial sales of its products and services under the said Mark. The Complainant has further submitted that since its inception, it has generated sales revenue



Praveen Kumar Jain

amounting to INR 1,00,41,88,00,000/- (approximately USD 1,256,249,229.88) up to the year 2023. The year-wise breakdown of the sales figures is reproduced below:

Sr. No.	Year	Sales (INR Lakhs)	Equivalent to USD in thousand
1.	2023-2024	353098 (appx.)	426629 (appx.)
2.	2022-2023	349868	430077
3.	2021-2022	249886	335103
4.	2020-2021	158775	207875
5.	2019-2020	143419	203749
6.	2018-2019	112504	160514
7.	2017-2018	80847	119261
8.	2016-2017	74847	112620
9.	2015-2016	60404	95925
10.	2014-2015	46283	74255
11.	2013-2014	37528	66339
12.	2012-2013	18052	33780
13.	2011-2012	9037	19364
14.	2010-2011	5320	11634
15.	2009-2010	3646	7532
16.	2008-2009	2183	5017
17.	2007-2008	1064	2573
18.	2006-2007	362	817
19.	2005-2006	31	70



Praveen Mr. /

A CA Certificate certifying the sales figure from 2005-2022 has been attached as **Annexure 5** with the Complaint.

Expenditure Towards Brand Promotion:

7. The Complainant has submitted that to promote the Mark, it has expended substantial amounts towards advertising and marketing activities. Over the past decade, the Complainant has incurred expenses exceeding INR 90,59,00,000/- (Rupees Ninety Crores Fifty-Nine Lakhs only) towards sales and advertisement. This substantial expenditure is indicative of the value, importance, and prominence accorded to the Mark. A year-wise breakdown of the advertising and marketing expenditure incurred by the Complainant is reproduced below-

Sr. No.	Year	Advertising and Marketing Expenses Consolidated India (INR Lakhs)	Equivalent to USD in thousand
1.	2023-2024	2732 (appx.)	3301(appx.)
2.	2022-2023	2678	3292
3.	2021-2022	2,160	2897
4.	2020-2021	1,085	1421
5.	2019-2020	1,365	1939
6.	2018-2019	953	1360
7.	2017-2018	878	1295
8.	2016-2017	1032	1553
9.	2015-2016	719	1142
10.	2014-2015	293	470



Praveen W. J.

11.	2013-2014	240	424
12.	2012-2013	32	60
13.	2011-2012	36	77
14.	2010-2011	23	50
15.	2009-2010	44	91
16.	2008-2009	24	55
17.	2007-2008	4	10
18.	2006-2007	6	14
19.	2005-2006	4	9

A CA Certificate certifying the advertising figures from the year 2005-2022 has been attached as **Annexure 5** with the Complaint.

Global Recognition and Online Visibility of the Complainant's Mark:

8. The Complainant stated that the foregoing establishes the Mark "CITIUSTECH" is synonymous with the Complainant and its business operations across the globe, having acquired a substantial reputation and goodwill over the last ten (10) years of continuous use. Consumers internationally associate the Mark exclusively with the Complainant. The degree of recognition and association is evident from the results of a GOOGLE search for "Citius" or "CitiusTech," which predominantly yield links related to the Complainant. A screenshot of the said Google search has been annexed as **Annexure 6**. Similar search results appear on other search engines, such as YAHOO and BING, where the results



Praveen Kumar Jain

primarily display links to the Complainant. Screenshots of these search results have been annexed as **Annexure 7**.

9. The Complainant stated that it had spent millions of dollars each year to promote and advertise the Mark around the world. The Complainant's extensive global advertising, marketing and use of the Mark establishes its worldwide reputation and goodwill under common law.

Awards and Recognitions Conferred Upon the Complainant:

10. The Complainant has submitted the list of awards and recognitions for its contribution in the Healthcare Industry, which are mentioned at para i of the complaint comprising sub paras i to xvi and the internet extracts evidencing the above have been annexed as **Annexure 8**.
11. The Complainant stated that apart from common law rights in the Mark, CitiusTech has also acquired statutory rights in the Mark through registration of the trade mark CITIUSTECH in the USA and India. Examples of the Complainant's trade mark details have been provided in the Complaint as under:

Appl./ Regd. No	Particulars	Country	Date	Class
2700671	CITIUSTECH	India	18-03-2014	09
2690440	CITIUSTECH	India	03-03-2014	09
4628676	CITIUSTECH	US	02-04-2014	09, 42
4628601	CITIUSTECH	US	09-04-2014	09, 42



Praveen W. Jain

3382199	CitiusTech	India	05-10-2016	42
3382200	CitiusTech	India	05-10-2016	42
5868810	CitiusTech RealSight	India	28-03-2023	09, 42
98628637	CitiusTech HealthACT	US	02-07-2024	09, 42
6490164	CitiusTech HealthACT+	India	21-06-2024	09, 42

The Complainant has annexed the copies of the registration certificate/ certified extracts as **Annexure 9**.

12. The Complainant has further stated that it is the owner of the top-level domain www.citiustech.com. The Complainant has annexed the printouts of registration details for the domain from www.whois.com ("WHOIS") as **Annexure 10**.
13. The Complainant has further stated that the main website www.citiustech.com provides information about the Complainant and details of its widespread presence. Further that, the website, which became active in 2005, prominently features the CITIUSTECH name and Mark and is accessible to people from all around the world. An Internet archive snapshot of the Complainant's website has been collectively annexed as **Annexure 11**. The printouts of some current pages of the websites of the Complainant have been annexed as **Annexure 12**.



Praveen W. Jain

14. The Complainant has further stated that the rights in its mark have been recognised in various legal proceedings. Additionally, the Complainant has also been successful in various WIPO domain complaints against the domain names identical to or deceptively similar to Mark CITIUSTECH. Brief details of the proceedings as stated in the Complaint are reproduced as under:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Case No.	Dispute Domain Name	Decision
1	CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited v. Susan Stewart Susan	D2022-3775	citiutech.com	Disputed domain transferred in favour of complainant.
2	CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited v. Domain Admin	DCO2022-0086	citiustech.co	Disputed domain transferred in favour of complainant.
3	CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited v. Somnath Gopale	D2022-3790	ctiustech.com	Disputed domain transferred to Complainant based on settlement between parties.
4	CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited v. VistaPrint Technologies Ltd.	D2015-2186 titled	citivstech.com	Disputed domain name was transferred to the Complainant.
5	CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited v. Domains by Proxy, LLC	D2019-0021	cituistech.com	Settlement form filed by the Parties pursuant to which the dispute domain name was transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.
6	CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited v. Munsha Ahmed	DAI2024-0005	citiustech.ai	Disputed domain name was transferred to the Complainant
7	CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited v. web master, Expired domain caught by auction winner.	D2024-3042	citiustechhealthact.com	Disputed domain name was transferred to the Complainant.
8	CitiusTech Healthcare Technology Private Limited v. Simran Kaur Walia	D2024-3363	Citiustechgroup.com	Disputed domain name was transferred to the Complainant.



Praveen W. Jr

The Complainant has attached the copies of the foregoing decisions as **Annexure 13**.

15. The Complainant has further stated that the foregoing information establishes that the Complainant is undoubtedly associated with the name "CITIUSTECH" and that it owns prior rights in the Mark – CITIUSTECH, not only through applications and registration as a trade mark in USA and India but also through common law rights acquired through continuous, exclusive and extensive use of the Mark in India and USA for around 10 years.

C.2: GROUNDS OF THE COMPLAINT:

The Complainant has submitted several grounds in support of its Complaint which are stated in brief as under:

1. **The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights:**

(Paragraph 4(b)(vi) (1) of Rules; Paragraph 4(i) of Policy)

- a. That the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's well-known, prior-registered trademark "CITIUSTECH," which is an invented mark of global recognition associated with the Complainant's commercial activities in India and the USA. The addition of the generic top-level domain suffix ".ORG.IN" by the Respondent does not distinguish the disputed domain from the Complainant's



Praveen W. J.

mark, given that such suffixes are deemed non-distinctive in domain name disputes.

- b. That the Complainant's rights in the mark predate the registration of the disputed domain. The similarity in appearance, sound, and overall commercial impression between the mark and the domain is such that it is likely to cause confusion or deception among the relevant internet consumers, who could mistakenly believe the Respondent's domain is affiliated with the Complainant.
- c. That the Respondent registered the disputed domain after the Complainant's registration and use of the trademark, indicating constructive knowledge of the Complainant's rights. Established precedents confirm that incorporation of a trademark in its entirety into a domain name is sufficient to demonstrate identity or confusing similarity.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name:

(Para 4 (b) (vi) (2) of Rules; Para 4(ii) of Policy)

- a. That the Respondent lacks any prior or legitimate rights in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized or licensed to use the Complainant's trademark, "CITIUSTECH," nor to register a domain name that incorporates or derives from it. The Respondent registered



Praveen W. J.

the disputed domain on 18-12-2024, while the Complainant has been operating under its trademark for nearly twenty years.

- b. That the Respondent is not related to the Complainant and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the disputed domain does not host an active webpage, as confirmed by the search results attached as **Annexure 18**. It is further submitted that the Respondent cannot demonstrate legitimate rights in the disputed domain as outlined in paragraphs 6(i), 6(ii), and 6(iii) of the Policy. Specifically, the Respondent has not utilised the domain, is not known by it, and has made no effort to use it for non-commercial or fair purposes.
- c. That many WIPO decisions support the conclusion that the absence of active use of a domain name that infringes on a Complainant's trademark negates any claim to legitimate rights. For instance, in *The Clorox Company v. Domain Administrator*, the panel ruled that the lack of active webpages associated with disputed domain names did not confer rights or legitimate interests to the Respondents. Further, the Respondent's lack of authorization to use the Complainant's mark indicates the absence of legitimate interest. In the case of *Six Continents Hotels, Inc. v. Patrick Ory*, the panel concluded that without a commercial relationship entitling the Respondent to use the



Praveen W. J.

Complainant's mark, no legitimate rights could be established.

3. The domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

(Para 4(b) (vi) (3) of Rules; Para 4(iii) of Policy)

- a. That the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. That the primary purpose of the Respondent in registering the domain was to profit from the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's mark, "CITIUSTECH." The disputed domain name is not being used for any non-commercial or fair purpose, and the Respondent is not operating any website under it.
- b. That the Respondent had actual or constructive knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration, establishing opportunistic bad faith registration under the Policy. A preliminary trademark search would have revealed the Complainant's trademarks and website, indicating that the Respondent acquired the domain with full knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The Complainant has further submitted that the use of a privacy service to conceal the Respondent's identity and contact information is *prima facie* evidence of bad faith. The Respondent's actions align with domain grabbing, which constitutes bad faith registration and use under the UDRP.



Praveen W. J.

- c. That by citing previous WIPO decisions, including *Telstra Corporation Ltd v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, the Complainant has submitted that the Policy makes it clear that the list of circumstances showing bad faith is non-exclusive. Further that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. The Complainant has further submitted that it has established a strong case for a favourable decision.

C.3: RELIEF SOUGHT BY THE COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant has prayed that the disputed domain **<citiustech.org.com>** be transferred to the Complainant.

D. RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE:

The Respondent has not filed any formal written reply in the matter. However, *vide* email dated 11-04-2025 sent to the Tribunal only, the Respondent has not disputed the facts of the case and has expressly stated that he had no objection to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The Respondent has further clarified that the domain name was registered while exploring the possibility of establishing a firm in the year 2024, and that the said name was suggested by an AI tool. The above-stated email is reproduced below:

Dear Mr. Jain,

I hope this message finds you well.

My name is Marmik, and I am writing in reference to the INDRP Case No. 1984 regarding the domain name citiustech.org.in. I would like to acknowledge receipt of the complaint and the enclosed documents shared via



Praveen W. Jain

email. I would also like to respectfully clarify that I have no objection to transferring the domain to Citius Tech. Back in November 2024, I was exploring options to start my own firm and, based on a suggestion from an AI tool, I purchased this domain. However, I did not register any firm or make any use of the domain thereafter.

At the time of registration, I was unaware that this domain name or a similar company name already existed. Upon learning of the conflict, I fully understand the situation and am willing to cooperate. To that end, I am sharing my identity and formally confirming that I have no intention of using or retaining the domain. I request that this matter be considered resolved at your end, and I am happy to assist further if any additional steps or information are required. Thank you for your understanding and support.

Best regards,
Marmik Chauhan
marmikchauhan.learning@gmail.com
+91 82382-66826

E. COMPLAINANT'S REJOINDER:

The Tribunal notes that the Complainant has not filed a formal Rejoinder to the Respondent's Response. However, the Tribunal takes on record the Complainant's email dated 14-04-2025, submitted pursuant to the directions issued on 11-04-2025, as the formal Rejoinder to the Respondent's Response. In the above-stated email, the Complainant has, in light of the admissions made by the Respondent, requested that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant. The said email has been reproduced below:

Dear Sir,

We write in reference to the captioned matter.

As per your instructions vide email dated 11.04.2025, we are responding to the Respondent's email dated 11.04.2025 (Respondent's response).

In its response, the Respondent has admitted that they have no objection to transferring the domain <citius.tech.org.in> to CitiusTech Healthcare



Praveen W. J.

Technology Private Limited and that there has been no use of the domain after its registration by the Respondent.

In light of the admissions made by the Respondent in its response, the Complainant requests the Ld Arbitrator that the disputed domain <citustech.org.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

Kindly consider this email as a formal reply to the Respondent's response.

Yours Sincerely,
Aarya Deshmukh

F. REASONING AND FINDINGS OF THE TRIBUNAL:

1. The Tribunal has carefully examined the Complaint dated 10-03-2025, the Respondent's email dated 11-04-2025 (taken on record as the Response), and the Complainant's email dated 14-04-2025 (taken on record as the Rejoinder). The Tribunal has also duly considered the applicable legal framework, including the *.IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP)*, the *INDRP Rules of Procedure*, and the relevant provisions of the *Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996* (as amended).
2. The Tribunal does not find it necessary to frame specific issues for determination in the present matter, as the Respondent has unequivocally admitted the claim and has voluntarily expressed his willingness to transfer the disputed domain name <citustech.org.in> to the Complainant. The Respondent has not disputed the facts asserted in the Complaint, nor has he filed any counter-claim or objection. The Complainant, on its part, has limited its relief to the transfer of the domain name in question.



P. Praveen W. J.

3. In light of the clear and unconditional admission by the Respondent, and in the absence of any contest, the Tribunal is of the view that no factual controversy remains to be adjudicated. Therefore, it is both proper and efficient to decide the matter on the basis of the admission made.
4. The Tribunal draws support from the principle enshrined in **Order XII Rule 6 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908**, which empowers courts to pronounce judgment based on admissions made by a party, either in pleadings or otherwise. The said provision reads as follows:

6. Judgment on admissions.—(1) Where admissions of fact have been made *either in the pleading or otherwise; whether orally or in writing*, the Court may at any stage of the suit, either on the application of any party or of its own motion and without waiting for the determination of any other question-between the parties, *make such order or give such judgment as it may think fit, having regard to such admissions.*

(2) Whenever a judgment is pronounced under sub-rule (1) a decree shall be drawn up in accordance with the judgment and the decree shall bear the date on which the judgment was pronounced.”

(emphasis added)

5. It is pertinent to refer to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Uttam Singh Duggal & Co. Ltd. v. United Bank of India*, (2000) 7 SCC 120, where the object and scope of Order XII Rule 6 were explained as follows:

12. As to the object of Order 12 Rule 6, we need not say anything more than what the legislature itself has said when the said provision came to be amended. In the Objects and Reasons set out while amending the said Rule, it is stated that “where a claim is admitted, the court has jurisdiction to enter a judgment for the plaintiff and to pass a decree on admitted claim. *The object of the Rule is to enable the party to obtain a speedy judgment at least to the extent of the relief to which according to the admission of the defendant, the plaintiff is entitled*”. We should not unduly narrow down the meaning of this Rule as the object is to enable a party to obtain speedy judgment.



Praveen W. J.

Where the other party has made a plain admission entitling the former to succeed, it should apply and also wherever there is a clear admission of facts in the face of which it is impossible for the party making such admission to succeed.

(emphasis added)

6. In *Vijaya Myne v. Satya Bhushan Kaura*, 2007 SCC OnLine Del 828, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi reiterated that the intent of Order XII Rule 6 is to provide expeditious relief in admitted claims and not to compel parties to undergo protracted trials when no factual dispute survives.
7. In the context of arbitration, a similar principle has been recognised. In *Rattan India Power Ltd. v. Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd.*, MANU/DE/1473/2025, Neutral Citation: 2025:DHC:1464, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi upheld an interim arbitral award under Section 31(6) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, wherein the tribunal granted relief solely on the basis of an admission made by one party, without requiring adjudication on remaining issues.
8. The Tribunal also finds support in the *Doctrine of Procedural Economy*, which is implicit in arbitration proceedings and aims to ensure that arbitral resources are not unnecessarily expended when a matter may be justly and efficiently resolved without a full trial. Where a party has voluntarily and expressly admitted the claim and the relief sought is limited, proceeding to a contested hearing would not serve the interests of justice or efficiency.
9. In view of the facts of the case, the statutory framework under the INDRP, and the judicial precedents cited above, the Tribunal finds that



Praveen W. J.

the Complainant has established its entitlement to the relief sought. Accordingly, it is held that the disputed domain name <**citiustech.org.in**> is liable to be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.

G. DIRECTIONS AND CONCLUSION:

1. In light of the foregoing findings, the Tribunal hereby directs that the disputed domain name <**citiustech.org.in**> be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant, in accordance with the *.IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy* and the *INDRP Rules of Procedure*, read with the applicable provisions of the *Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996* (as amended).
2. In accordance with Rule 20 of the *INDRP Rules*, the signed original copy of this award shall be provided to the .IN Registry, which shall, in turn, communicate the same to the parties *via* email and by uploading it on the Registry's official website. Parties may obtain certified copies of the award from the Registry, if required.
3. This award has been executed on non-judicial stamp paper of ₹100/-. Any deficiency in stamp duty, if applicable, shall be borne and rectified by the concerned party before the appropriate authority in accordance with applicable laws.

New Delhi

07-06-2025



Praveen W. Jain
(Praveen Kumar Jain)

The Sole Arbitrator