सत्यमेव जयते

INDIA NON JUDICIAL

Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi

₹100

e-Stamp

Certificate No.	:	IN-DL41978850701329Y
Certificate Issued Date	:	29-Jun-2026 12:15 PM
Account Reference	:	SELFPRINT (PU)/ dl-self/ NEHRU/ DL-DLH
Unique Doc. Reference	:	SUBIN-DLDL-SELF92671854635917Y
Purchased by	:	S S RANA AND CO
Description of Document	:	Article 12 Award
Property Description	:	AWARD
Consideration Price (Rs.)	:	0 (Zero)
First Party	:	LUCY RANA
Second Party	:	LUCY RANA
Stamp Duty Paid By	:	LUCY RANA
Stamp Duty Amount(Rs.)	:	100 (One Hundred only)

₹100

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

IN-DL41978850701329Y

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: <pancrabake.in>

IN THE MATTER OF

Pumpernickel Associates, LLC
3630 South Geyer Road, Suite 100,
St. Louis, MO, 63127,
U.S.A

..... **Complainant**

-----versus-----

Mahesh Kumar Meena (as per WHOIS records)
Shree Annapurna Caterers and Events
P No. C-26, Narayan Vihar A Asarpura,
Ajmer Road, Jaipur,
Rajasthan, India – 302020
Email: mndfoodproductions@gmail.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.

1. The Parties

The **Complainant** in this arbitration proceeding is **Pumpernickel Associates, LLC**, with its principal place of business at 3630 South Geyer Road, Suite 100, St. Louis, MO, 63127, U.S.A.

The **Respondent** in this arbitration proceeding is **Mahesh Kumar Meena**, of the address: P No. C-26, Narayan Vihar A Asarpura, Ajmer Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India – 302020 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 **<PANERABAKE.IN>** with the .IN Registry. The Registrar of the disputed domain is **Hostinger Operations**.

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 Ms. Lucy Rana to act as the Sole Arbitrator in the matter. The Arbitrator confirmed her availability and gave her 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.
April 8, 2026	NIXI handed over the Domain Complaint and Annexures thereto to the Arbitrator. The Arbitrator, vide email on the same date, 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.
April 16, 2026	As the Complainant's Counsel failed to submit proof of service within the stipulated time period, in the interests of justice, the Arbitrator granted a final extension of five (05) days to submit proof of service in the matter.
April 21, 2026	Complainant's Counsel sent a full set of the domain complaint and annexures via email to the Respondent to an email ID which was

	different from the one mentioned in the Whois records provided by NIXI.
April 22, 2026	The Arbitrator directed the Complainant's Counsel to serve a full set of the domain complaint as filed, along with annexures, upon the Respondent via email (the one mentioned in the Whois records provided by NIXI, i.e., mndfoodproductions@gmail.com) and provide proof of successful delivery (which may include delivery receipts/reports) within three (3) days.
April 26, 2026	Complainant's Counsel confirmed that the domain complaint has been delivered through email and provided a copy of the delivery report as an evidence.
April 29, 2026	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 May 13, 2026.
May 14, 2026	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 three (03) days to respond to the complaint.
May 18, 2026	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:

i. That the Complainant is organized and incorporated under the laws of State of Delaware, U.S.A. That the Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of Panera Bread Company and Panera, LLC. The Trademark rights, however, vest with the Complainant. That the Complainant is engaged in production, sale, and promotion of wide range of food and beverage products, including breads, baked goods, sandwiches, coffee, soups, and salads falling in classes 29 and 30 and other allied and cognate products; and services relating to restaurant and catering services in class 43 and other allied and cognate services (hereinafter referred to as the "said goods and services").

ii. That the Complainant was established in the year 1980 as St. Louis Bread Company, a humble community bakery founded with a sourdough starter from San Francisco which has over the years evolved into a multinational operation with more than 2,300 outlets across the United States and Canada. That the Complainant is one of the most widely recognized fast-casual food brands in the world, with a substantial and ever-growing consumer base.

iii. That the Complainant has regularly been running extensive advertisements from time to time in various countries showcasing its portfolio of products under the trade name

and trademark PANERA. That the Complainant also maintains the website www.panerabake.in (registered on April 28, 1998), which has contributed immensely to the popularity of the Complainant as well as its products both internationally and nationally. Additionally, information pertaining to the Complainant and its said goods and service under the said trademark PANERA are displayed, advertised, promoted through social media accounts such as Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, Pinterest, etc. That the internet is a ready medium of exposure to potential consumers and members of trade to widespread information about the Complainant and its said goods and service under the trademark PANERA. In this regard, the Complainant has annexed extracts from their website/domain name along with its whois report as Exhibit-A. Further, the Complainant has annexed extracts from their social media platforms as Exhibit-B.

iv. That, in connection with its global business operations, the Complainant owns and extensively uses the trade name and trademark PANERA. The said trade name PANERA is built on the core philosophy of offering delicious, freshly prepared, and clean food made from carefully selected ingredients. That the Complainant is committed to going the extra mile to ensure the quality and satisfaction associated with its products. Further, the Complainant provides omni-channel access to its services through mobile ordering, catering, rapid pick-up for takeaway orders, curbside pick-up and delivery, each designed to enhance convenience for its customers. It is pertinent to note that the said trademark is not only a well-known trademark of the Complainant but also forms an integral part of its trade name.

v. That the Complainant, in order to safeguard its right in its said trademarks, has secured several trademark registrations and filed applications worldwide including in India. That the Complainant has been using the mark PANERA since 1996 in India. That the Complainant has superior national and international statutory rights in the mark PANERA. That there is sufficient expertise of brand management and preservation of brands prestige and global & national presence within the Complainant, and in view thereof, Complainant has its PANERA trademarks duly registered in India under the Trade Marks Act, 1999 as per the following particulars mentioned in the table below :

TRADE MARK	REGISTRATION NO.	CLASS	APPLICATION DATE / CLAIM OF USER	STATUS / VALIDITY
Panera BREAD	2403118	29, 30 and 43	September 28, 2012 / Proposed to be used	Registered and valid up to September 28, 2032

 (MOTHER BREAD LOGO)	2401252	29, 30 and 43	September 24, 2012 / October 15, 1996	Registered and valid up to September 24, 2032
PANERA (PANERA DEVICE)	2401251	29, 30 and 43	September 24, 2012 / Proposed to be used	Registered and valid up to September 24, 2032
PANERA BREAD (Word)	4122391	9, 32 and 35	March 19, 2019 / Proposed to be used	Registered and valid up to March 19, 2029

These registrations evidence the recognition of distinctiveness of the Complainant's aforesaid trademarks and the exclusive statutory and proprietorship rights of the Complainant in India. That the PANERA trademark and its formatives have acquired global reputation and goodwill on account of high quality of products and services offered by the Complainant. In this regard, Complainant has annexed registration certificates along with copies of e-registers detailing the abovementioned registrations as Exhibit-C.

vi. That the Complainant has obtained statutory rights in the PANERA trade mark in several countries/jurisdictions worldwide including USA, UK, Canada, Jordan, Brazil, Switzerland, Australia, Chile, Philippines, Singapore, Jordan, New Zealand, European Union, Uruguay, China, Israel, Norway, Bahrain, Mexico, Brazil, etc.

vii. That the Complainant has created and curated a distinctive portfolio of high-quality, original photographs showcasing its said goods including but not limited to burgers, subs, breads, and other food items (hereinafter referred to as the "said copyrighted images"). These copyrighted images are the result of considerable skill, labor, and investment, and are exclusively owned by the Complainant. That the said copyrighted images are prominently featured on the Complainant's digital and print marketing channels such as its official website, social media platforms, brochures, catalogues, and promotional materials and have become an integral part of the brand's visual identity. In this regard, Complainant has annexed documents pertaining to the above mentioned as Exhibit-D. That the said copyrighted images, over time, have acquired substantial consumer recognition and are intrinsically linked to the goodwill and reputation of their business.

viii. That the Complainant maintains high standard of trade and service and spend significant sums and efforts to maintain high quality goods and services. That the

Complainant has garnered brand recognition by investing in the latest marketing strategies, sales distribution, logistics, and technology and customer service standards. That the Complainant's success and that of its parent companies, is also the result of offering menu items and services that address changing customer and market demands, including drive-thru service, order ahead for rapid pick-up, member reward cards, and food that is 100% clean with no artificial preservatives, sweeteners, flavors and no colours from artificial sources.

ix. That the Complainant, through its parent companies, has been continuously promoting its business under the PANERA trademark including through the internet, print and audio-visual media, magazines, television and other avenues with wide circulation and viewership all over the world including India. In this regard, a copy of publication and other marketing and advertisement materials, news articles, press releases, and franchise information as Exhibit-E.

x. That the Complainant under the trade name and trademark PANERA, under the goods and services, has built up valuable and global brand recognition and reputation. That the public at large, world-wide and in India associate and identify the PANERA trademark solely with the Complainant. That the Complainant with its parent companies conducts business in the billions annually under the PANERA trademark. That the PANERA trademarks of the Complainant are well-known trademarks. In this regard, Complainant has annexed extracts of business standing and sales as reflected in financial data for the years 2003 to 2012 as Exhibit-G.

xi. That the Complainant's products under the trade name and trademark PANERA, its domain name panerabake.in and its trading name i.e. Panera Bread represents important proprietary rights of the Complainant. That the Complainant has invested years of time, capital, effort and resources and attained immense goodwill and reputation in respect of its products/domain name/trading name under the mark PANERA. Consequently, a secondary meaning has come to be attached with respect to Complainant's products/domain under the mark PANERA and the same is exclusively associated worldwide, including India by members of the trade and public with the Complainant and its products/business.

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 Respondent's domain name "panerabake.in" is identical to a name, trademark/ trade name in which the Complainant has rights

i. That the disputed domain name is identical to and comprises in its entirety the Complainant's registered trade name/trademark PANERA/PANERA BREAD.

ii. That the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name without any meaning or significance independent of the Complainant's registered trademark PANERA/PANERA BREAD.

iii. That the well-known nature of the Complainant's registered trade mark PANERA/PANERA BREAD and the Respondent's use of the same clearly establishes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant, its business activities and intellectual property rights. The unmistakable identity/deceptive similarity between the Complainant's trade name and mark on one hand and Respondent's choice of its disputed domain name on the other hand, is patently misleading to the consuming public.

iv. That the Complainant states that the disputed domain name is identical/similar to the Complainant's domain name panerabread.com.

v. As per the WHOIS record, the disputed domain name was registered on May 21, 2025, whereas the Complainant's domain name panerabread.com was created/registered many years before the disputed domain name, on April 28, 1998. Thus, the Complainant's adoption and use of the registered trade name/trademark PANERA/PANERA BREAD is prior to the Respondent's registration, adoption and use of the disputed domain name.

vi. That the Complainant has prior rights in the trade name/trademark comprising of PANERA/PANERA BREAD vis-à-vis the Respondent.

B. <u>The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name</u>

i. That the Respondent's adoption and use of a dishonestly adopted and confusingly similar disputed domain name does not amount to a 'bona fide' offering of goods and services. Given the well-known nature of the Complainant's registered trademarks, its widespread use and repute in India and all around the world, and the factum of Respondent acquiring the disputed domain name for the sole purpose of preventing the rightful owners from acquiring it, the Respondent's such adoption thereof to provide services under the disputed domain name is not bona fide.

ii. Intentional ignorance of the Respondent in disregarding the Complainant's pre-existing registered trade mark and domain name, and commencing use of the disputed domain name comprising PANERA evidences its mala fide. It is trite law in respect of domain name proceedings that use which dishonestly and intentionally rides on the repute of another mark cannot constitute 'bona fide' offering of goods and services. The mere fact that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to conduct business (by hoarding the disputed domain name for the purpose of preventing the Complainant from using the same) is not sufficient to show that it has a right/legitimate interest or is bona

fide offering goods or services. Whilst a business may be lawful, its use of a deceptively and confusingly similar/identical domain name, trade name and mark PANERA/PANERA BAKE may still be mala fide. Therefore, by no stretch of imagination, the Respondent cannot demonstrate any reason relating to the bona fide offering of goods or services at any point in time whatsoever.

iii. That the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. In fact, the Respondent is not authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the registered trademark PANERA. Further, the Complainant has first used the trade name and trademark PANERA/PANERA BREAD in the year 1996 and registered its domain comprising PANERA/PANERA BREAD since the year 1998. Due to the extensive and continuous use of the PANERA/PANERA BREAD trademarks, the same have become well-known and come to be exclusively associated with the Complainant and no one else. Hence, the Respondent cannot establish any association with the disputed domain name for any reasons whatsoever.

iv. That, when typing 'PANERA' into the Google search engine, the Complainant's website www.panerabread.com is the main result on the page.

v. That the Respondent is not making any legitimate non – commercial or legitimate fair use of the disputed domain name. That the conduct of the Respondent cannot come under the definition of bona fide use. That the registration of the disputed domain name is aimed to benefit from the immense goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's registered trademark PANERA/PANERA BREAD, divert visitors/customers by creating initial internet confusion and thereby commercially profit from use of the Complainant's registered trade name and trademark PANERA/PANERA BREAD.

vi. Thus, the Respondent has indulged in (i) unfair use of the disputed domain name with an intention to reap profits therefrom, (ii) tarnishing the goodwill and reputation enjoyed by the Complainant's well-known trade name and trademark PANERA/PANERA BREAD. The Respondent, therefore, cannot justify any legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

C. <u>The disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith</u>

i. That the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's prior rights in the registered trademarks, as well as of Complainant's business and trade name, and yet chose to adopt the deceptively and confusingly similar/identical disputed domain name. This clearly indicates that the Respondent has acquired the disputed domain name for the sole purpose of causing unnecessary damage to the Complainant. That the registration of the disputed domain name is detrimental to the Complainant's statutory right in the registered trade mark PANERA/PANERA BREAD.

ii. That the conduct of the Respondent amply proves its mala fide to divert internet users to its website by using the mark/name of the Complainant and consequently creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation of the Registrant's website. Further, internet users desirous of accessing the Complainant's website will inevitably get confused and therefore may be led to the disputed domain name. That the general public, in all likelihood, will be deceived into believing that the Respondent's disputed domain name is either affiliated with, an extension of or is associated to the Complainant's business and trademark PANERA, which in fact, is not the case.

iii. That the Respondent purposely registered the disputed domain name, solely looking to prevent the Complainant from using the same. That the Respondent's possession of the disputed domain name is therefore an act of bad faith.

iv. Bad faith, on account of the Respondent is further evidenced by the fact that it has also reproduced the Complainant's original advertising images in an unauthorised manner on the disputed domain name with the sole motive to associate itself with the Complainant. It is pertinent to mention that these advertising images are the exclusive copyrighted works of the Complainant. These images have been copied without the Complainant's consent, authorization, or license and are being used on the disputed domain name in violation of the Complainant's statutory rights under the Copyright Act, 1957.

v. Such dishonest acts on the part of the Respondent which prima facie seems designed solely to take unfair advantage of the distinctive character and reputation of the Complainant's intellectual property rights in its registered trademarks PANERA/PANERA BREAD and copyrights.

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 domain name **<PANERABAKE.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 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. <u>The Registrant's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name, trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights</u>
(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 PANERA trademark in several countries of the world, including in India.
- The Complainant has also submitted that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark PANERA in its entirety and hence is similar/identical to the Complainant's trademark.
- That the Complainant states that the disputed domain name is identical/similar to the Complainant's domain name <u>panerabread.com</u>.
- The Complainant has also made submissions and provided evidence in respect of its prior adoption and use, as well as reputation in its PANERA trademark.
- The Complainant has further submitted that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name without any meaning or significance independent of the Complainant's registered trademark PANERA.

Thus, in light of the trademark rights presented by the Complainant's and the documents placed on record, the Arbitrator finds that the Complainant has been successful in establishing their rights in PANERA 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 PANERA 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 **<PANERABAKE.IN>** is confusingly similar to the Complainant's PANERA trademark, 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. <u>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)</u>

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 below assertions of 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.

- The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and when typing 'PANERA' in the search engine Google, the Complainant's website www.panerabread.com is the main result on the page.
- Further, the Complainant has not authorized, licensed or otherwise allowed the Respondent to make any use of its PANERA trademark, in a domain name or otherwise.
- The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark PANERA, which clearly evidences that the Respondent is attempting to mislead consumers

into believing that it is affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, thereby creating initial internet confusion.

- The Respondent is not making any legitimate non – commercial or legitimate fair use of the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.
- The Respondent's past use of the disputed domain name, which incorporated Complainant's original advertising images in an unauthorised manner, misleading users into thinking that disputed domain has direct association with the Complainant.
- 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. As held in the prior panel in *Amundi v. GaoGou (INDRP/776)*, the Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, and once such case is established, then it is the Respondent upon whom there is the burden of proof, to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, if the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(b) of the 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. <u>The Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith</u> (Paragraph 4(c) and Paragraph 7 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 rights and no authorization to use PANERA trademark.
- The Respondent's awareness that PANERA trademark is popular and famous worldwide, including in India. As the Complainant has been using PANERA trademark extensively and continuously since the year 1996 in India. Thereby, the Respondent had constructive notice of the Complainant and its rights in PANERA trademark.

- The use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent is solely with mala fide intentions in order to deceive people browsing on the Internet into believing that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant.
- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name, solely looking to prevent the Complainant from using the same and the Respondent's possession of the disputed domain name clearly satisfies an act of bad faith.
- The Respondent's past use of the disputed domain name which incorporated Complainant's original advertising images in an unauthorised manner on the disputed domain name, was misleading or was bound to be misled the users into thinking that disputed domain has direct association with the Complainant.

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 submissions of the Complainant, specifically regarding the relevance of paragraph 7 (b) and (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 (b) and (c) of the Policy, namely:

"*(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*".

"*(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 **<PANERABAKE.IN>** to the Complainant.



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

Lucy Rana, Sole Arbitrator

Date: June 29, 2026.

Place: New Delhi, India.