Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107448

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107448
Time of filing	2025-04-01 09:02:01
Domain names	ziaagents.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Zoho Corporation Private Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion GmbH

Respondent

Name	Béla Málnási

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns the United States trademark registration no. 5478797 “ZIA”, registered on May 29, 2018, for “providing on-line non-downloadable software powered by artificial intelligence for analyzing sales process trends” in class 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 7, 2025.

The Complainant’s trademark registration cited above therefore predates the registration of the disputed domain name.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a global business software provider. It provides a wide range of products and services for business, including sales, marketing, finance, e-mail, human resources, legal, security and IT management, BI and analytics, project management and developer platforms.

The Complainant was founded in 1996. In 2004, it introduced a software tool called “Zoho Virtual Office”, followed in 2005 by “Zoho Writer”, a word processor. In 2006, it launched “Zoho Sheet”, a spreadsheet software; “Zoho Creator”, a low-code platform for building custom apps; and “Zoho Projects”, a project management system. Today, the Complainant employs over 18,000 staff worldwide, serves over 100 million users around the world and has an international network of offices in Africa, the Americas,

Europe, Asia Pacific and the Middle East.

In 2015, the Complainant launched a new product “Zia”, a foundational Artificial Intelligence, facilitating intelligent and contextual actions across the Complainant’s ecosystem of Zoho apps. In 2018, the Complainant launched “Ask Zia” which is a system-wide conversational assistant that helps employees work smarter and accomplish tasks more effectively.

On February 4, 2025, the Complainant launched “Zia Agents”, an Artificial Intelligence platform which empowers enterprises to access, build, and distribute intelligent, autonomous digital agents across their organizations. The Complainant advertises Zoho advertises its “Zia Agents” software services via its main website www.zoho.com under the URL www.zoho.com/zia/agents/.

The Complainant points out that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 7, 2025, i.e., three days after the Complainant announced the launch of its “ZIA Agents” product on February 4, 2025. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name exactly because of the Complainant’s launch of its “ZIA Agents” services.

On March 19, 2025, the disputed domain name redirected to a website where it was offered for sale at a price of GBP 13,758.15. On March 28, 2025, the disputed domain name was offered for sale at a slightly modified price of GBP 13,879.15 on the same website.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark “ZIA”, or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.
No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s distinctive trademark “ZIA.” The additional descriptive term “Agents” does not negate, but rather reinforces, this similarity – particularly in the context of modern agentic AI systems.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has provided prima facie evidence that the Respondent has neither used nor prepared to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent has also not engaged in legitimate non-commercial or fair use, nor is he commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not contested these

statements. No facts suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Its only use has been to resolve to a website listing the domain name for sale, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial fair use (see Carrefour SA v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Mark Cendic, WIPO Case No. D2022-1276).

Considering (i) the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's "ZIA" trademark, (ii) the Respondent's failure to respond or show any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the timing of the registration – just days after the Complainant's launch of its "ZIA Agents" product, (iv) the offer to sell the disputed domain name at prices far exceeding registration costs, and (v) the implausibility of any good-faith use, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy (see Carrefour SA v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Mark Cendic, WIPO Case No. D2022-1276).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **ziaagents.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dr. Thomas Schafft**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-05-20

Publish the Decision