# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108337

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108337 |
| Time of filing | 2026-01-19 14:23:21 |
| Domain names | mrproptek.com |

## Case administrator

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Olga Slanařová (Case admin) |

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | PROPTEK REALTY PRIVATE LIMITED |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Grow India Ventures Pvt Ltd |

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, conducting business under the company and trade name PROPTEK REALTY PRIVATE LIMITED, has demonstrated rights in the trademark PROPTEK through multiple trademark registrations, including:

- Indian trademark (word) PROPTEK, Registration No. 3575528, filed on 21 June 2017 and registered on 21 June 2017 in Class 36;
- Canadian trademark (word) PROPTEK, Registration No. TMA1012535, filed on 11 January 2016 and registered on 9 January 2019 in Classes 35, 36, 37;
- Philippines trademark (word) PROPTEK, Registration No. PH4202100503013, filed on 8 February 2021 and registered on 30 April 2021 in Classes 35, 36;
- New Zealand trademark (word) PROPTEK, Registration No. 1170414, filed on 9 February 2021 and registered on 10 August 2021 in Classes 35, 36, 37;
- Portuguese trademark (word) PROPTEK, Registration No. 664390, filed on 13 April 2021 and registered on 28 October 2021 in Classes 35, 36, 37.

In addition, the Complainant owns several domain names incorporating the term "PROPTEK", including <proptek.in>, registered on 10 January 2014, which resolves to the Complainant's principal website.

The above-mentioned trademark registrations are hereinafter collectively referred to as the "PROPTEK Trademark".

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is Proptek Realty Private Limited, a company incorporated in India on 6 April 2023. It operates in the field of real estate brokerage and agency services.

The Respondent is identified in the Registrar's Whois data as Grow India Ventures Pvt Ltd - Ks Bhatia, with a listed address in India.

The disputed domain name was registered on 27 September 2024 and resolves to a website offering real estate services and marketing Indian real estate properties.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be cancelled.

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to succeed in the administrative proceeding:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

I. THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND THE CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME TO THE COMPLAINANT'S MARK

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the PROPTEK Trademark.

The disputed domain name incorporates the wording "PROPTEK", preceded by the letters "MR" and ending with the ".COM" generic top-level domain (TLD). The PROPTEK Trademark is therefore clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Under the Policy, the test for identity or confusing similarity is a straightforward comparison between the disputed domain name and the relevant trademark. Where a domain name wholly incorporates the complainant's trademark—or where a dominant feature of the mark remains clearly recognizable—the domain name is generally considered confusingly similar. The mere addition of letters or terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The applicable TLD is typically disregarded in this analysis, as it is a functional element required for domain name registration.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's PROPTEK Trademark.

The Complainant has therefore satisfied the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

II. THE RESPONDENT'S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Once the Complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Complainant states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and that it has not authorised the Respondent, whether expressly or impliedly, to use the PROPTEK Trademark or to register the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is identified in the Registrar's Whois data as Grow India Ventures Pvt Ltd – Ks Bhatia, located in India. There is no evidence on record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, nor is there evidence that the Respondent holds any trademark or other rights in the term "PROPTEK".

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's PROPTEK Trademark in its entirety, preceded by the letters "MR". As noted above under the first element, such an addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Panels have also recognised that the registration of a domain name comprising a complainant’s mark in its entirety carries a risk of implied affiliation and does not, in itself, confer rights or legitimate interests.

The evidence on record shows that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a website offering real estate services and marketing Indian real estate properties. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name redirects to the website at <dooritt.com>, which states that "Mr. Proptek has now become dooritt", and continues to offer real estate services relating to Indian properties.

On the present record, the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The use of a domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety to offer services in the same sector does not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests. Nor is there any evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or to demonstrate any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

**III. THE REGISTRATION AND THE USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IN BAD FAITH**

The Complainant has demonstrated that it holds registered rights in the PROPTEK Trademark, which predates the registration of the disputed domain name and is valid in India, where the Respondent is located.

The disputed domain name incorporates the PROPTEK Trademark in its entirety, together with the letters "MR" and the generic TLD ".COM". As noted above, such additions do not dispel confusing similarity.

The Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration. The Respondent is located in India, where the Complainant's trademark is registered, and the disputed domain name has been used in connection with real estate services relating to Indian properties, i.e., in the same sector in which the Complainant operates. The composition of the disputed domain name, which wholly incorporates the Complainant's mark, further supports an inference of knowledge and targeting.

In this context, the Panel recalls that paragraph 2 of the Policy places a responsibility on domain name registrants to determine whether their registration infringes or violates the rights of third parties. The registration of a domain name incorporating in its entirety a prior trademark in the same line of business supports a finding of bad faith registration.

As regards use, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolved to an active website offering real estate services and marketing Indian real estate properties. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name redirects to the website at <dooritt.com>, which states that "Mr. Proptek has now become dooritt", and continues to offer real estate services relating to Indian properties.

In the Panel's view, such use demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s PROPTEK Trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In light of the above circumstances, the Panel finds that 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.

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, and taking into account that the Complainant has requested the cancellation (and not the transfer) of the disputed domain name, the Panel orders that the domain name <mrproptek.com> be cancelled.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **mrproptek.com**: Cancelled

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Ivett Paulovics** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-23

Publish the Decision