

தமிழ்நாடு तमिलनाडु TAMILNADU

FG 198405

RAJA PANNIR SELVAM
CHENNAI

K. SARAVANAN, M.Com
STAMP VENDOR
Lic No 1090 / B4 / CH(C)2021-5

மாவட்டக் கருவூலம்
ஜன
05-202
சென்னை-600 035

BEFORE THE NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA (NIXI)

IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION BETWEEN

Henkel AG & Co. KGaA

...Complainant

Versus

Dotpe / Dotpe pvt. Ltd.

...Respondent

IN RESPECT OF DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME:
<loctite.co.in>

INDRP Case No.: 2170

ARBITRATION AWARD

BEFORE THE NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA (NIXI)

IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION BETWEEN

Henkel AG & Co. KGaA
Henkelstrasse 67
40589 Duesseldorf,
Germany

…Complainant

Versus

Dotpe / Dotpe pvt. Ltd.
8th Floor, Tower D, Unitech World- Unitech
Cyber Park
Sector 39, Village Jharsa
Gurugram
Haryana 122001
India

…Respondent

IN RESPECT OF DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME:
<loctite.co.in>
INDRP Case No.: 2170
ARBITRATION AWARD

Date: October 28, 2026
Venue: Chennai

Raja Pannir Selvam

Sole Arbitrator

INDEX

S. No.	Particulars	Page No.
A.	The Parties and their Representatives	3
B.	The Domain Name and Registrar	3
C.	Procedural History	3
D.	Complainant's Contentions	4
E.	Respondent's Contention	5
F.	Discussion and Findings	6
G.	Decision	9

1. THE PARTIES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

1. Complainant

Henkel AG & Co. KGaA
Henkelstrasse 67
40589 Duesseldorf
Germany

Authorized Representative:
Rois Tan
CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB
Sveavägen 9, 10th floor, 111 57
Stockholm, Sweden
Telephone: +1 302-636-5401 x 60555
Email: udrp@cscglobal.com

2. Respondent

Dotpe / Dotpe pvt. Ltd.
8th Floor, Tower D, Unitech World- Unitech Cyber Park
Sector 39, Village Jharsa
Gurugram, Haryana 122001
India
Email: showroom@dotpe.in

2. THE DOMAIN NAME AND REGISTRAR

The disputed domain name **<loctite.co.in>** is registered through the Registrar Endurance International Group India Private Limited (IANA ID 801217), which is accredited by the .IN Registry (NIXI). The WHOIS details provided by NIXI identify the Respondent as the registrant of the disputed domain name and record that the disputed domain name was created on September 18, 2025.

3. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

i. The Complainant filed the present Complaint under the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) in respect of the disputed domain name <loctite.co.in> on September 29, 2026.

ii. On September 26, 2026, NIXI sought the consent of the undersigned to act as Sole Arbitrator in the present matter, and the undersigned furnished the signed Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence confirming the absence of any conflict of interest.

iii. The National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI) appointed Mr. Raja Pannir Selvam as the Sole Arbitrator in the present matter on October 6, 2026, and the matter was formally handed over to the undersigned on the same date, along with soft copies of the Complaint, its annexures and the WHOIS details of the disputed domain name.

iv. Upon entering reference, the Sole Arbitrator issued a Notice to the Respondent under Rule 5(c) of the INDRP Rules of Procedure on October 6, 2026, by email to the parties and NIXI, calling upon the Respondent to file its Reply within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of receipt of the Notice and directing the Complainant to serve a complete copy of the Complaint along with all annexures upon the Respondent and to furnish proof of service.

v. In compliance with the directions of the Tribunal, the Complainant served the amended Complaint along with annexures upon the Respondent by electronic mail on October 7, 2026, at the email address reflected in the WHOIS records, and also dispatched a physical copy of the Complaint along with annexures to the Respondent by courier (FedEx) on October 8, 2026. The Complainant furnished proof of service to the Sole Arbitrator by email dated October 8, 2026, enclosing a copy of the email sent to the Respondent and the courier tracking reference. The courier tracking records show that the physical copy was delivered to the Respondent on October 13, 2026.

vi. The Respondent was granted time to file its Reply to the Complaint within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of receipt of the Notice. The said period expired on October 21, 2026. Despite valid service of the Notice and the Complaint, and the expiry of the prescribed timeline, the Respondent failed to file any Reply or make any submission in the present proceedings, nor did the Respondent respond to any of the communications in the proceedings.

vii. In view of the Respondent's failure to appear or contest the proceedings, the Tribunal proceeded to adjudicate the matter ex-parte, on the basis of the pleadings and material available on record, in accordance with the INDRP Policy and Rules of Procedure.

4. COMPLAINANT'S CONTENTIONS

It is contended by the Complainant that:

i. The Complainant, Henkel AG & Co. KGaA, is a German multinational chemical and consumer goods company founded in 1876, operating globally through its Henkel Adhesive Technologies and Henkel Consumer Brands business units.

ii. The LOCTITE brand is one of the Complainant's leading brands under its Henkel Adhesive Technologies business and has been a global leader in adhesives, sealants and surface treatments for over 50 years, with products available in over 80 countries worldwide.

iii. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for LOCTITE in India and various other jurisdictions, including Germany, the United States, the United Kingdom and the European Union. The Complainant also owns numerous domain names incorporating the LOCTITE trademark, including <loctite.com> and <loctite.in>, which predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

iv. The Complainant has used the LOCTITE trademark since 1958 and has developed substantial goodwill and reputation in the mark through extensive marketing and promotion. The Complainant's LOCTITE brand is well recognised and respected worldwide and is distinctively associated with the Complainant and its products and services.

v. The disputed domain name <loctite.co.in> was registered by the Respondent on September 18, 2025, and incorporates the Complainant's LOCTITE trademark in its entirety. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademark and that the ".co.in" extension is to be disregarded while assessing identity or confusing similarity.

vi. The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant and has not been granted any permission, licence or authorisation to use the LOCTITE trademark, including in a domain name. The Respondent is also not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the WHOIS records identify the registrant as "Dotpe / Dotpe pvt. Ltd."

vii. The disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant's trademark registrations, its registration of the domain names <loctite.com> and <loctite.in>, and its commercial use of the LOCTITE trademark. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and cannot be considered fair use.

viii. Prior to receiving the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter of July 17, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a website under the name "Unique Traders and Suppliers" offering hardware and safety products unrelated to the Complainant's business (Annexure F-1). The Complainant contends that such commercial use capitalised on the reputation and goodwill of the LOCTITE trademark and could mislead Internet users regarding the website's affiliation with the Complainant.

ix. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a blank page (Annexure F-2) and that the Respondent has not demonstrated any legitimate use of the domain name or website. Accordingly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

x. The Complainant contends that the LOCTITE trademark enjoys international recognition and that the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant relies on its longstanding use and reputation, its trademark registrations, and its business presence in India, including the establishment of a LOCTITE manufacturing facility in Kurkumbh in 2024.

xi. The Complainant submits that the Respondent deliberately selected the disputed domain name to attract Internet users searching for the Complainant and its products. The earlier use of the disputed domain name for a website offering unrelated hardware and safety products, followed by its current resolution to a blank page, is relied upon as evidence of bad-faith registration and use.

xii. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name are in bad faith and requests that the disputed domain name

<loctite.co.in> be transferred to the Complainant in accordance with the INDRP Policy.

5. RESPONDENT'S CONTENTION

Despite service of the Arbitration Notice dated October 6, 2026, the Respondent has failed to file any Reply or Detailed Statement to the Complaint within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of receipt of the Notice, which period expired on October 21, 2026.

Pursuant to the directions of the Sole Arbitrator, the Complainant thereafter served a copy of the Complaint along with all supporting annexures upon the Respondent by email on October 7, 2026, at the email address reflected in the WHOIS records.

In addition, the Complainant also dispatched a physical copy of the Complaint along with annexures to the Respondent by courier on October 8, 2026. The courier tracking records placed on record show that the said physical copy was successfully delivered to the Respondent on October 13, 2026.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and despite having received the Arbitration Notice as well as both the electronic and physical copies of the Complaint and annexures, the Respondent has not submitted a response.

Accordingly, the Respondent was afforded sufficient opportunity to present its case but has chosen not to do so.

In view of the absence of any reply from the Respondent, the present proceedings are conducted ex-parte. However, even in an uncontested matter, the Complainant must stand on its own merits and is required to establish each of the three elements as prescribed under Paragraph 4 of the INDRP Policy. No adverse inference can be drawn merely on account of the Respondent's non-appearance.

The disputed domain name <loctite.co.in> was registered in the name of the Respondent on September 18, 2025. The material placed on record shows that the disputed domain name earlier resolved to a website offering hardware and safety products and, as of August 20, 2026, no longer resolves to any active website (Annexure F-2). There is **no material on record to demonstrate any bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name** by the Respondent independent of the Complainant's trademark rights.

The record further shows (Annexure K) that the Complainant's cease and desist letter of July 17, 2026, addressed to the Respondent, was answered on the same day from the email address of "Unique Traders & Suppliers", the business whose website was hosted at the disputed domain name, with the Respondent's email addresses in copy, stating that there was no objection to the notice and agreeing to shut down the website at the disputed domain name. The Complainant's subsequent requests of July 17, July 24, July 31 and August 7, 2026 for

transfer of the disputed domain name went unanswered. At no stage has the Respondent asserted any right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

6. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

The Complainant relies upon Paragraph 4 of the INDRP Policy and is required to establish that:

a) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and
b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
c) the Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Tribunal has examined the Complaint, documents on record, and the legal submissions advanced by the Complainant, including reliance placed on prior INDRP, UDRP and WIPO decisions and judicial precedents, and proceeds to record its findings under each of the three heads set out in Paragraph 4 of the INDRP Policy.

The findings recorded hereinafter are based on an assessment of the facts pleaded, the evidence placed on record, and the settled principles governing domain name disputes under the INDRP and are not based merely on the non-appearance of the Respondent.

The Tribunal now proceeds to examine, in detail, whether the Complainant has satisfied the requirements under Paragraph 4 of the INDRP Policy.

a) Identical or Confusingly Similar

i. The Complainant has established rights in the LOCTITE trademark through its trademark registrations in India and various other jurisdictions.

ii. The disputed domain name <loctite.co.in> incorporates the Complainant's LOCTITE trademark in its entirety. The Complainant has relied upon *Prada S.A. v. Feifei / Doublefist Limited*, INDRP/1981, wherein it was held that there is confusing or deceptive similarity where the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the complainant's trademark.

iii. The Complainant has further relied upon *AB Electrolux v. GaoGou of YERECT*, INDRP/630, in support of its contention that the country code top-level domain ".in" may be disregarded while assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark.

iv. Having considered the disputed domain name as a whole, the Tribunal finds that the LOCTITE trademark is incorporated in its entirety and remains clearly recognisable. The addition of the ".co.in" extension does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark.

v. Accordingly, the Tribunal holds that the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under Paragraph 4(a) of the INDRP Policy.

b) Rights or Legitimate Interests

i. The Complainant has asserted that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant and has not been granted any permission, licence or authorisation to use the LOCTITE trademark, including in a domain name.

ii. The WHOIS records identify the Respondent as "Dotpe / Dotpe pvt. Ltd.", which does not resemble the disputed domain name. The Complainant has also contended that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

iii. The Complainant has relied upon *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. D2014-1875, in support of its contention that, in the absence of a licence or permission to use the trademark, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could reasonably be claimed.

iv. The material placed on record shows that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website offering hardware and safety products. The Complainant contends that such commercial use capitalised on the reputation and goodwill of the LOCTITE trademark or misled Internet users regarding affiliation with the Complainant.

v. The Complainant has further submitted that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a blank page and, as noted above, the screenshot placed on record (Annexure F-2) shows that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to any active website. The Respondent has not demonstrated any attempt to make legitimate use of the domain name and website. In this regard, the Complainant has relied upon *Philip Morris USA Inc. v. Muhammad Faisal*, WIPO Case No. D2016-0621.

vi. The Tribunal finds that the Respondent's earlier use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of Paragraph 7(a) of the INDRP Policy. The Respondent has not been authorised by the Complainant to use the LOCTITE mark, and the use of a domain name identical to a reputed mark, without authorisation, to host a commercial website that appears to be directed at the same trade channels cannot be regarded as good-faith use. The Respondent has neither filed a Reply nor produced any material to rebut the Complainant's contentions or demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. On the contrary, when put on notice by the Complainant, the Respondent's side did not assert any right in the disputed domain name but agreed to shut down the website (Annexure K).

In view of the above, the Complainant has satisfied the requirements set out under Paragraph 4(b) of the INDRP Policy.

c) Registration and Use in Bad Faith

i. The Complainant has used the LOCTITE trademark since 1958 and has submitted that the mark enjoys international recognition and substantial goodwill. The Complainant's trademark registrations and domain names, including <loctite.com> and <loctite.in>, predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

ii. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's LOCTITE trademark in its entirety. The Complainant has contended that the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant's trademark and business when registering the disputed domain name.

iii. The Complainant has relied upon *Telstra Corp. Ltd. v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, in support of its contention that the Respondent could not plausibly have been unaware of the Complainant's brand when registering the disputed domain name and that, in certain circumstances, inactivity may amount to bad-faith use.

iv. The Complainant has further relied upon the establishment of a LOCTITE manufacturing facility in Kurkumbh, India, in 2024, and its business presence in India as evidence of the reputation of the LOCTITE brand in India.

v. The Complainant submits that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name to intentionally confuse Internet users searching for the Complainant and redirect them to a website offering hardware and safety products unrelated to the Complainant's business, and imply a false affiliation that does not exist. The Complainant has relied upon *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. D2009-0273, in support of its contention that the incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name without a plausible explanation may indicate bad faith.

vi. The material placed on record further shows that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to any active website (Annexure F-2). The Complainant has relied upon *Telstra Corp. Ltd. v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, and other decisions cited in the Complaint in support of its contention that passive holding may constitute bad-faith registration and use.

vii. The Tribunal notes that LOCTITE appears to be a coined term with no ordinary dictionary meaning. The Respondent has not offered any explanation for choosing it, and, in the absence of one, it is not apparent to the Tribunal what good-faith reason the Respondent could have had for registering a domain name identical to it.

viii. Given the Complainant's reputation in the LOCTITE mark, including in India, and the fact that the Respondent's website offered hardware products, a field in which the Complainant's goods under the LOCTITE mark appear to be commonly sold, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the mark when it registered the disputed domain name. The Tribunal finds that the Respondent knew or must have known of the Complainant's mark at the time of registration.

ix. The Respondent's conduct after receiving the Complainant's cease and desist letter is also relevant. The website at the disputed domain name was taken down, yet the Respondent retained the registration and ignored the Complainant's repeated requests for its transfer (Annexure K). Holding on to a domain name identical to the Complainant's mark, after having acknowledged the Complainant's objection and without any stated purpose of its own, is consistent only with an intent to prevent the Complainant, as the owner of the mark, from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, and is not the conduct of a registrant acting in good faith.

x. Having considered the Complainant's longstanding use of the LOCTITE trademark, its business presence in India, the incorporation of the trademark in its entirety into the

disputed domain name, the prior use of the disputed domain name for a website offering unrelated products, the Respondent's conduct after notice, and the fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to any active website, the Tribunal finds that the circumstances support a finding of bad-faith registration and use.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under Paragraph 4(c) of the INDRP Policy.

7. DECISION

In view of the foregoing findings, namely that the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith, the Complaint is allowed.

The National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI) is directed to transfer the domain name <loctite.co.in> to the Complainant, Henkel AG & Co. KGaA.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Place: Chennai
Date: October 28, 2026

Raja Pannir Selvam
Sole Arbitrator