सत्यमेव जयते

INDIA NON JUDICIAL

Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi

₹100

e-Stamp

Certificate No.	:	IN-DL37526283226997Y
Certificate Issued Date	:	19-Jan-2026 06:08 PM
Account Reference	:	SELFPRINT (PU)/ dl-self/ NEHRU/ DL-DLH
Unique Doc. Reference	:	SUBIN-DLDL-SELF98401527768889Y
Purchased by	:	S S RANA AND CO
Description of Document	:	Article 12 Award
Property Description	:	AWARD
Consideration Price (Rs.)	:	0 (Zero)
First Party	:	VIKRANT RANA
Second Party	:	VIKRANT RANA
Stamp Duty Paid By	:	VIKRANT RANA
Stamp Duty Amount(Rs.)	:	100 (One Hundred only)

₹100

SELF PRINTED CERTIFICATE TO BE VERIFIED BY THE RECIPIENT AT WWW.SHCILESTAMP.COM

IN-DL37526283226997Y

Please write or type below this line

BEFORE THE SOLE ARBITRATOR UNDER THE .IN DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY
(Appointed by the National Internet Exchange of India)
ARBITRATION AWARD
Disputed Domain Name: <dpworldlogistic.in>

IN THE MATTER OF

DP World FZE
5th Floor, LOB 17,
Jebel Ali Free Zone,
P.O. Box 17000, Dubai,
United Arab Emirates

..... **Complainant**

-----versus-----

Mr. Monu Dayal
Manoharkant, Society, Chanekhda
Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India- 380051
Phone: +91-7899506000
Email: dpworlds@shiftingsuvidha.com

..... **Respondent**

Statutory Alert:
1. The authenticity of this Stamp certificate should be verified at 'www.shcilestamp.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.

Vikrant Rana

1. The Parties

The **Complainant** in this arbitration proceeding is **DP World FZE**, with its principal place of business at 5th Floor, LOB 17, Jebel Ali Free Zone, P.O. Box 17000, Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

The **Respondent** in this arbitration proceeding is **Monu Dayal**, of the address: Manoharkant, Society, Chanekhda, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India- 380051 as per the WHOIS records.

2. The Domain Name, Registrar and Registrant

The present arbitration proceeding pertains to a dispute concerning the registration of the domain name <**dpworldlogistic.in**> with the .IN Registry. The Registrant in the present matter is **Monu Dayal**. Further, the Registrar of the disputed domain is **OVI HOSTING PVT LTD**.

3. Procedural History

The arbitration proceeding is in accordance with the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), adopted by the National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI). The procedural history of the matter is tabulated below:

Date	Event
November 11, 2025	NIXI sought consent of Mr. Vikrant Rana to act as the Sole Arbitrator in the matter. The Arbitrator confirmed his availability and gave his consent vide email on the same date, along with the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence in compliance with the INDRP Rules of Procedure.
November 17, 2025	NIXI handed over the Domain Complaint and Annexures thereto to the Arbitrator.
November 19, 2025	The Arbitrator directed Complainant's Counsel to provide an apostilled/notarized authorisation document.
November 26, 2025	Complainant's Counsel provided a duly signed and notarized PoA.
November 27, 2025	The Arbitrator directed the Complainant's Counsel to serve a full set of the domain complaint as filed, along with annexures, upon the Respondent by email as well as physical mode (in case Complaint had already not done so) and provide proof of service within seven (07) days.
December 01, 2025	Complainant's Counsel sent a full set of the domain complaint and annexures to the Respondent by email and kept Arbitrator in copy.
December 01, 2025	The Arbitrator noted that the emails sent by the panel to the Respondent's email addresses dpworlds@shiftingsuvidha.com and info@dpworldlogistic.in have bounced, and accordingly directed the

Vikrant Rana

	Complainant's Counsel to confirm if emails sent by them to the Respondent have been successfully delivered or not.
December 03, 2025	Complainant's Counsel confirmed that the domain complaint has been delivered through courier as well as email (on dpworlds@shiftingsuvidha.com) and provided a copy of the delivery report as an evidence.
December 04, 2025	The Arbitrator accordingly commenced arbitration proceedings in respect of the matter. Respondent was granted time of fourteen (14) days, to submit a response, i.e. by December 18, 2025.
December 19, 2025	As no response was received from the Respondent within the stipulated time period, in the interests of justice, the Arbitrator granted a final extension of five (05) days to respond to the complaint.
December 26, 2025	As no response was received from the Respondent, the Arbitrator concluded proceedings and reserved the present award.

4. Factual Background – Complainant

Counsel for the Complainant, on behalf of the Complainant in the present matter, has, inter alia, submitted as follows:

- That the Complainant, **DP WORLD FZE,** founded in 2005 by the merger of Dubai Ports Authority and Dubai Ports International, is a global leader in providing logistics, port terminal operations, maritime services, free trade zones, port development and technology-driven trade solutions under the trademark/name **DP WORLD**. The Complainant handles 70 million containers annually from about 70,000 vessels.

- That the Complainant maintains its website at www.dpworld.com which has been registered since March 26, 2002, and where information on the Complainant's business under the **DP WORLD** trademark/name is available to the public in India and worldwide. The Complainant has annexed the WHOIS results for the said domain as **Exhibit-4**.

- That the Complainant has been using the trademark/ name **DP WORLD** continuously and extensively since December 16, 2005, in India. The Complainant has annexed supporting evidence as **Exhibit-6**.

- That the Complainant has obtained registrations for **DP WORLD** trademarks in India and across the world. In this regard, Complainant has annexed a list of trademark registrations and applications owned by the Complainant as **Exhibit-7** and **Exhibit-8**.

- That the Complainant has placed on record evidence in support of its claims of goodwill and reputation in the trade mark **DP WORLD** including **Exhibits 9** to **13**, comprising inter alia proof of partnership and sponsorship agreements with renowned companies

and organizations, promotional and marketing materials, online extracts from official social media accounts, details of awards and accolades received, revenue figures, and other supporting documents.

- That the Complainant submits that the Respondent earlier operated domain names www.dpworldlogistic.com and www.dpworldpackersandlogistics.com. The Complaint had issued a cease-and-desist notice dated May 8, 2024 against the Respondent's adoption and use of the **DP WORLD** trademark as a part of their domain name www.dpworldlogistic.com (registered since March 18, 2023), trade name DP World Logistics Packers and Movers and their logo for logistics services being identical/similar to the Complainant's. It is further submitted that the Respondent has also received a complaint from a customer filed on Indian Consumer Complaints Forum on April 25, 2024 for its poor-quality services through the domain name www.dpworldlogistic.com for cheating and extorting money from them, which was further tarnishing the image of the Complainant. Complainant has submitted supporting evidence as **Exhibit-14**.

- That the Complainant claims that in the absence of any corrective steps, they were constrained to file complaints under Uniform Domain-Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) against www.dpworldlogistic.com under case no. D2025-0474 on February 06, 2025 and www.dpworldpackersandlogistics.com under case no. D2025-0631 on February 18, 2025 and obtained favorable decisions recognising that abovementioned domain names were deceptively similar to the Complainant's trademark **DP WORLD** and were obtained in bad faith. Complainant has placed **Exhibit-15** as supporting evidence in this regard.

- That in view of Respondent's continued use of the disputed domain name www.dpworldlogistic.in under the same trade name **DP WORLD Logistics, Packers and Movers** and the logo , the Complainant issued another cease-and-desist letter dated May 16, 2025 to the Respondent and has followed up with them multiple times. However, the Respondent continues to operate the disputed domain name in bad faith.

- That the Complainant submits that the Respondent is a habitual infringer and continues to violate the Complainant's proprietary rights and therefore, they are constrained to file the present complaint against the Respondent's domain name www.dpworldlogistic.in.

5. Contentions And Legal Grounds Submitted By The Complainant

In support of the requirements under the captioned provisions of the INDRP (combined with the relevant Rules of Procedure) the Complainant has submitted that:

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

i. That the Complainant's rights in the trademark **DPWORLD** and domain registration of www.dpworld.com predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. In this regard, the Complainant has placed reliance on *Uniroyal Engineered Products Vs Nauga Network Services D 2000-0503 (WIPO July 18, 2000).*

ii. That the disputed domain name www.dpworldlogistic.in starts with and incorporates the Complainant's well-known trademark/name **DP WORLD** in its entirety. The addition of the dictionary word 'Logistic' to the disputed domain name is descriptive of the Complainant's and the Respondent's logistics and transport business and does not lend any distinctiveness to the said domain name as the term **DP WORLD** remains to be its predominant feature. The Complainant has placed reliance on SAP SE v. Mohammed Aziz Sheikh, Sapteq Global Consulting services [WIPO Case No. D2015-0565, May 19, 2015] and SAP AG v. PrivacyProtect.org / John Harvard, John Havard [WIPO Case No. D2013-1097, August 9, 2013].

b. **The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.**

i. That the Respondent registered the domain name www.dpworldlogistic.in in the year 2024 i.e., several decades after the Complainant invested millions of dollars in popularizing and seeking registration of the trademark **DP WORLD** and trade name since 2005 and domain name www.dpworld.com since March 26, 2002.

ii. That the Respondent is aware of Complainant's prior rights in the trademark **DP WORLD** at the time of registration of the disputed domain name www.dpworldlogistic.in on October 05, 2024. Further, the Complainant had already issued cease-and-desist notice dated May 8, 2024 to the Respondent to take-down their earlier domain name www.dpworldlogistic.com, notifying the Respondent of its prior rights. The Complainant has placed reliance on Charles Schwab & Co., Inc. v. Josh Decker d/b/a I GOT YOUR TIX, WIPO Case No. D2005-0179 (Apr. 20, 2005) and Accord Young Genius Software AB v. MWD, James Vargas, WIPO Case No. D2000-0591 (Aug. 7, 2000).

iii. That the Complainant has not permitted the Respondent to use the trademark **DP WORLD** or its variants. The Complainant notes that the Respondent's purpose in choosing the disputed domain name was plainly to use fame of the Complainant's **DP WORLD** trademark, trade name and domain name to generate web-traffic and to confuse internet users who might be looking for the Complainant and their quality services, to convey that the Respondent provides logistics services, authorised or associated with the Complainant. Such use by the Respondent is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name.

iv. That the Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and pursuant to the Policy, the burden shifts to the Respondent to show it does have a right or legitimate interests. In this regard, the Complainant has placed reliance on *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., WIPO Case No. D2003-0455 and Clerical Medical Investment Group Limited v. Clericalmedical.com (Clerical & Medical Services Agency), WIPO Case No.* 12 *D2000-1228*; *DP World FZE vs. Dpworldlogistic.com WIPO Case no. D2025-0474.*

c. **The Domain Name was registered or is being used in bad faith.**

i. That the Respondent is a habitual infringer and has registered and used the domain name www.dpworldlogistic.in in bad faith, despite having been duly notified of the Complainant's prior rights in the **DP WORLD** trademark and the Complainant's objections to the Respondent's unauthorized adoption and use of the said mark, including the registration of the domain name www.dpworldlogistic.com. Accordingly, the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's prior trademark rights in **DP WORLD** at the time of registration of the impugned domain name.

ii. That the Respondent offers unauthorised logistics services to the customers and uses the Complainant's prior used and registered **DP WORLD** trademark/name. Therefore, it is evident that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and to conduct infringing activities. The Complainant has placed reliance on SAP AG v. Peifang Huang [WIPO Case No. D2014-0928, July 28, 2014].

iii. That the disputed domain name is nearly identical to the Complainant's distinctive **DP WORLD** trademark, trade name and domain name. The Respondent has wrongfully registered the said domain name with the intent to make illegitimate commercial gains by offering identical services, namely logistics, to customers. The Respondent is not engaged in any bona fide or honest business activity through the nearly identical domain name, which has been registered and used solely to divert internet traffic by exploiting the Complainant's well-known **DP WORLD** trademark, name, and domain name.

iv. The Complainant submits that even constructive knowledge of a famous/well-known mark is sufficient to prove bad faith, and in this regard, has placed reliance on Google v. Abercrombie 1, FA0111000101579 (Nat. Arb. Forum Dec. 10, 2001).

6. Reliefs claimed by the Complainant (Paragraphs 10 of the .IN Policy and 3(b)(vii) of the .IN Rules)

The Complainant has requested that the disputed domain name www.dpworldlogistic.in be transferred to them.

7. Respondent's Contentions

As already mentioned in the procedural history of the matter, despite having been duly served with a copy of the Domain Complaint as filed, and thereafter being granted adequate time to respond to the same, the Respondent had not submitted any response thereto, or in fact any communication of any kind to the Arbitrator during pendency of arbitral proceedings in the matter.

8. Discussion and Findings

As mentioned in Paragraph 4 of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, the Complainant is required to satisfy the below three conditions in a domain complaint:

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

ii. The Registrant has no rights and legitimate interest in respect of the domain name; and

iii. The Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used either in bad faith or for illegal/ unlawful purpose.

i. The Registrant's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name, trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights
(Paragraph 4(a) of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy)

- In the present domain dispute, the Complainant has furnished information about their trade mark rights over the **DP WORLD** trademark in several countries of the world.
- The Complainant has also submitted that the disputed domain incorporates the Complainant's trademark **DP WORLD** in its entirety and hence is identical to the Complainant's trademark.

- The Complainant has also made submissions and provided evidence in respect of its prior adoption and use, as well as reputation in its **DP WORLD** trademark. It has also been noted that the Complainant's domain registration of www.dpworld.com predates the registration of the disputed domain name by several years.
- The Complainant has further submitted that the addition of the dictionary term 'Logistic' to the disputed domain is descriptive of the Complainant's services and does not lend any distinctiveness to the disputed domain name in which the Complainant has established prior rights, and the Arbitrator accepts the submission.

Thus, in light of the trademark rights presented by the Complainant and the documents placed on record, the Arbitrator finds that the Complainant has been successful in establishing their rights in the **DP WORLD** trademark. It is well established that trademark registration is recognized as prima facie evidence of rights in a mark. The Complainant, by filing documents showing its ownership over registered **DP WORLD** trademark, has established its prior rights in the same worldwide.

Further, it has been held by prior panels deciding under the INDRP that there exists confusing similarity where the disputed name incorporates the Complainant's trade mark, such as *Kenneth Cole Productions v. Viswas Infomedia INDRP/093, Indian Hotel Companies Limited v. Mr. Sanjay Jha, INDRP/148 <Gingerhotels.co.in>, Carrier Corporation, USA v. Prakash K.R. INDRP/238 <Carrier.net.in>, M/s Merck KGaA v. Zeng Wei INDRP/323 <Merckchemicals.in>, Colgate-Palmolive Company & Anr. v. Zhaxia INDRP/887 <Colgate.in>*and *The Singer Company Limited v. Novation In Limited INDRP/905 <singer.co.in>*. More recently, as held by the INDRP Panel in the matter of *Tata Communications Limited v. Chandan [INDRP/1880]* on August 29, 2024 – "*It is well established that the full incorporation of a complainant's trademark in a disputed domain name is sufficient for a finding of identical or confusing similarity*".

Accordingly, it may be stated that the disputed domain name **<dpworldlogistic.in>** is confusingly similar to the Complainant's **DP WORLD** trade mark, and incorporates the same in entirety.

In view of the aforesaid, the Arbitrator accepts that the Complainant's rights in its trademarks, under Paragraph 4(a) of the INDRP has been established.

ii. The Registrant has no rights and legitimate interest in respect of the domain name (Paragraph 4(b) and Paragraph 6 of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy)

As per paragraph 6 of the Policy, a Registrant may show legitimate rights and interests in a domain name, by demonstrating any of the following circumstances:

(a) before any notice to the Registrant of the dispute, the Registrant's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;

(b) the Registrant (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the Registrant has acquired no Trademark or Service Mark rights; or

(c) the Registrant is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without the intention of commercial gain by misleadingly or diverting consumers or to tarnish the Trademark or Service Mark at issue.

In this regard, in the absence of any rebuttal from the Respondent, and in light of the Complainant's assertions below, the Arbitrator accepts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in accordance with Paragraph 4(b) of the INDRP.

- The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name is much subsequent to the Complainant's adoption of its **DP WORLD** trade mark.
- The Complainant has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to make any use its **DP WORLD** trade mark, in a domain name or otherwise.
- That the Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and the Respondent has failed to come forth to prove it does have a right or legitimate interests.
- That the disputed domain **<dpworldlogistic.in>**, which incorporates the Complainant's **DP WORLD** trade mark in entirety, is bound to induce members of the public and trade to believe that the Respondent has trade connection, association, relationship, or approval of the Complainant, when it is not so.
- That the Complainant has obtained favorable orders under Uniform Domain-Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) against the Respondent and has successfully recovered the domains www.dpworldlogistic.com (Case no. D2025-0474) and www.dpworldpackersandlogistics.com (Case no. D2025-0631) incorporating the **DP WORLD** trade mark.
- The disputed domain name is currently non-operational.

As such, Respondent, by choosing not to respond to the Complaint, has failed to satisfy the conditions enshrined in paragraph 6 of the INDR Policy.

In the present domain dispute, the Respondent has not joined the arbitral proceedings, despite being duly served with the domain complaint, and consequently, not come forward with any assertion or evidence to show any bonafides. Thus, as mentioned above, in view of the lack of assertions on part of the Respondent, coupled with the other contentions put forth by the Complainant, the Arbitrator accepts the Complainant's assertion, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in accordance with Paragraph 4(b) of the INDRP.

iii. **The Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith (Paragraph 4(c) of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy)**

In this regard, Complainant has *inter alia* contended the below points regarding Respondent's bad faith:

- The Respondent has no prior right and no authorization to use the **DP WORLD** trade mark, name, and domain name.
- The Complainant and its services offered under the **DP WORLD** trade mark, name, and domain name have been popular and well known worldwide, including in India, for several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Respondent had constructive notice of the Complainant and its prior rights in the **DP WORLD** trade mark at the time of registration.
- That, despite being notified of the Complainant's prior rights in the **DP WORLD** trademark, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of infringing conduct and has attempted to register multiple domain names incorporating the **DP WORLD** trademark. Accordingly, the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's prior rights in the **DP WORLD** trade mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and appears to have registered the same in bad faith, with the intention of exploiting the Complainant's well-known **DP WORLD** trade mark, name, and domain name.
- The Complainant has obtained favourable orders under the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) against the Respondent and has successfully recovered the domain names www.dpworldlogistic.com (Case No. D2025-0474) and www.dpworldpackersandlogistics.com (Case No. D2025-0631), thereby establishing that the aforesaid domain names were deceptively similar to the Complainant's **DP WORLD** trade mark and had been registered and used in bad faith.

In this regard, it is pertinent to reiterate that the Respondent has not submitted any reply or rebuttal to the Complainant's contentions, or any evidence in support of its bona fide registration or use of the disputed domain name.

In view of the consolidated submissions of the Complainant, including the above, specifically regarding the relevance of paragraph 7(c) of the .IN Policy in the present domain dispute, the Arbitrator finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name prima facie appears to constitute conduct as mentioned in paragraph 7(c) of the Policy, namely "*(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*".

In view of the aforesaid, the Arbitrator concludes that the Complainant has satisfactorily proved the requirements of Paragraph 4(c) and Paragraph 7 of the INDRP.

9. Decision

Based upon the facts and circumstances, the Arbitrator allows the prayer of the Complainant and directs the .IN Registry to transfer the domain **<dpworldlogistic.in>** to the Complainant.

The Award is accordingly passed, and the parties are directed to bear their own costs.



Vikrant Rana, Sole Arbitrator

Date: January 21, 2026

Place: New Delhi, India.