Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108536

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108536
Time of filing	2026-03-27 05:04:19
Domain names	nrisystemtechno.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Nomura Research Institute, Ltd.
Organization	NRI System Techno,Ltd.

Complainant representative

Organization	RODENBAUGH LAW LLC

Respondent

Organization	Detent Enterprises

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 first Complainant, Nomura Research Institute Ltd., owns Japanese trademark registration No. 5507298 for a mark containing the phrase “NRI System Techno”, registered on July 13, 2012, in International Classes 09, 35, 37, and 42.

The Complainant also owns several trademark registrations consisting of, or containing, the term “NRI”, including:

- International trademark registration No. 1346274, registered on July 25, 2016, in International Classes 09, 35, 36, and 42, designating India and the Philippines;
- Japanese trademark registration No. 5366699, registered on November 5, 2010, in International Classes 09, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, and 42;
- Japanese trademark registration No. 2209684, registered on February 23, 1990; and
- United States trademark registration No. 5532231, registered on August 7, 2018, in International Classes 9, 35, 36, and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The First Complainant, Nomura Research Institute Ltd., is a Japanese technology and consulting firm. The Second Complainant, NRI

System Techno Ltd., is a majority-owned subsidiary of the First Complainant and the principal user of the above-mentioned trademarks. It operates within the NRI corporate group and provides system planning, design, development, maintenance, and operation services. The First and Second Complainants are collectively referred to as the “Complainant”.

The disputed domain name <nrisystemtechno.com> was registered on July 8, 2024.

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

Rights

The Complainant has established that it owns trademark registrations for **NRI SYSTEM TECHNO** in Japan and **NRI** in Japan, the United States, the Philippines, and India.

The Panel finds that the Complainant’s Japanese **NRI SYSTEM TECHNO** trademark is incorporated in its entirety in the disputed domain name. In addition, the Complainant’s **NRI** trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, it will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7).

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is a standard technical requirement of domain-name registration and is disregarded when assessing identity or confusing similarity (see Rollerblade, Inc. v. Chris McCrady, WIPO Case No. D2000-0429).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks.

No Rights or Legitimate Interests

A complainant is required to establish a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a case is made, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to demonstrate their rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Failure to do so results in the complainant satisfying paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (see Article 2.1 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0 and WIPO Case No. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

In the present case, based on the Complainant’s submission, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie

case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests.

In particular, based on the screenshots of the website associated with the disputed domain name, as well as the Panel's own review of the website at https://nrisystemtechno.com/, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that the Respondent has used the website to impersonate the Complainant by creating the misleading impression that it is operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainant.

The website prominently displays the Complainant's NRI SYSTEM TECHNO and NRI trademarks, offers services corresponding to those provided by the Complainant, and includes the contact email address `admin@nrisystemtechno.com, thereby misleading Internet users as to the website's source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including impersonation, passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.13.1).

Accordingly, in the absence of any evidence from the Respondent to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is therefore satisfied.

Bad Faith

In assessing whether the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, the Panel has considered the overall circumstances of the case.

The Complainant's trademark rights long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The **NRI SYSTEM TECHNO** trademark has been registered since 2012, and the **NRI** trademark has been registered since 1990, whereas the disputed domain name was registered only in 2024.

The disputed domain name is identical to the company name of the Second Complainant, NRI System Techno Ltd. In addition, the **NRI** trademark is also registered in India, where the Respondent is domiciled.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

That inference is reinforced by the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Second Complainant's company name and the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety, and resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant by creating the false impression of authorization by, or affiliation with, the Complainant (see the Panel's findings on rights or legitimate interests above).

The Panel finds that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, it represents an attempt to attract Internet users to the website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

Given the Complainant's longstanding presence in the market, the prior registration and use of its trademarks, and the Respondent's impersonating use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **nrisystemtechno.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Karel Šindelka**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-10

Publish the Decision