

1. **The Parties**

The **Complainant** in this arbitration proceeding is **MHG IP Holding (Singapore) PTE Ltd.**, a company incorporated under laws of Singapore and having its registered address at **2, Alexandra Road, 05-04/05, Delta House, Singapore, 159919**.

The **Respondent** in this arbitration proceeding is **Anantara Spa** of the address **1st Floor, G-Square, Gachibowli, Hyderabad, Telangana – 500081, India** 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 **“anantaraspa.co.in”** with the .IN Registry. The Registrar in the present matter is **GoDaddy**.

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
April 06, 2026	NIXI sought the consent of Ms. Lucy Rana to act as the Sole Arbitrator in the matter The Arbitrator informed of her availability and gave her consent vide email and also provided the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence in compliance with the INDRP Rules of Procedure
April 13, 2026	NIXI handed over the Domain Complaint, Annexures, Board Resolution and Power of Attorney thereto to the Arbitrator. NIXI further mentioned in their hand-over email that in case the Complainant has failed to submit a notarized Power of Attorney, Board Resolution, annexures, or other relevant documents they can submit the same directly to the Ld. Arbitrator marking all others in cc.
April 14, 2026	Arbitrator directed the Complainant to provide revised annexures and ensure that annexures do not exceed the page limit prescribed under Rule 4 of the INDRP Rules of Procedure, within seven (07) days' time.
April 16, 2026	The Complainant provided the revised annexures.



	The Arbitrator asked the Complainant to confirm the status of the delivery of the domain complaint upon the Respondent and was directed to serve a full set of the domain complaint along with the annexures upon the Respondent (by email as well as physical mode) and provide proof of service within seven (07) days, if the same was not served upon the Respondent by them.
April 20, 2026	The Complainant confirmed having sent the domain complaint and annexures to the Respondent via email and courier. The Complainant also provided the courier booking receipt, tracking details and proof of service by email.
April 21, 2026	The Arbitrator accordingly commenced arbitration proceedings in respect of the matter. Respondent was granted time of fourteen (14) days, to submit a response.
May 06, 2026	No response received from the Respondent. The Arbitrator granted a final and non-extendable period of three (03) days , to submit a response.
May 11, 2026	No response received from the Respondent. The Arbitrator concluded the proceedings and reserved the present award.

4. Factual Background – Complainant

Counsel for the Complainant, on behalf of the Complainant in the present matter, has submitted as follows:

- That the Complainant owns and operates resorts and spas which combine luxury with the culture and natural beauty in the most enchanting destinations in the world and is amongst the largest hospitality and leisure companies in the Asia Pacific region and also own and operate a highly successful spa business, consisting of over 70 branded spas in various parts of the world including Asia, Africa and the Middle East.
- That ANANTARA is derived from the Sanskrit word meaning ‘without end’, and the word ‘ANANTARA’ embraces the excitement of discovery and the vibrant energy of new horizons.
- That Complainant’s chain of ANANTARA hotels have been marvelled as one of the most astute luxury hotel developers in the world and they have received many top accolades and awards. In this regard, the Complainant has provided copies of few such awards as Annexure-B.
- That the Complainant owns the ANANTARA Trademarks in respect of its resorts and spas since the year 2000, in India and in over 65 jurisdictions of the world and, have continuously expanded its business under the said trademarks by opening ANANTARA

Arang

resorts and spas in a number of countries around the world. In this regard, copies of a few registration certificates have been annexed as Annexure-H.

- That the Complainant has ensued consistent branding by continuously and extensively used the ANANTARA brand and trademarks across its resorts and standalone spas.
 - That the Complainant has earned revenue in millions through their various ANANTARA resorts and spas since the year 2001 till 2025.
 - That the Complainant expends enormous amount of skill and resources in promoting, marketing and advertising its services under the ANANTARA Trademarks throughout the world including India and hence, have also been acknowledged and acclaimed in many of the international periodicals and journals to be the operator of the world's best resort hotels, spas and cruise ship services.
-
- That several of the Complainant's hotels, resorts and spas under the ANANTARA Trademarks have featured in both the regional and worldwide lists of best hotels published by leading travel magazines and publications around the world. In this regard, the Complainant has provided copies of a few news articles featuring information about them and the ANANTARA Trademarks along with details of the Indian customers as Annexure-D.
 - That, the Complainant has extensive presence and outreach to global customer base, through its dedicated website, <https://www.anantara.com/en> which was created in the year 2000. The said website has been accessible from India since its inception and it has always been possible for residents in India to book their stay at the Complainant's ANANTARA resorts through this website.
 - That the Complainant actively promotes and advertises its ANANTARA Trademarks and goods and services thereunder through numerous social media sites/platforms such as Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, Twitter etc. and have provided extracts from social media pages evidencing the same as Annexure-G.
 - That the Complainant has obtained injunction orders and decree from Indian Courts against infringement and misuse of its trademark, ANANTARA along with various favourable orders in a number of UDRP/INDRP domain name complaints against third party infringers who were found making use of identical/similar domain names. In this regard, the copies of the favourable orders have been annexed as Annexure-I.
 - The Complainant has also secured domain orders in its favour against third-party entities using a nomenclature similar to that of the Respondents in the present matter, namely, 'Anantara Spa'.



- a. anantaraspa.in – Award dated 20.08.2022;
- b. anantarathaispa.in – Award dated 09.02.2023; and
- c. anantaraspaandheri.in – Award dated 10.12.2025.

5. **Disputed Domain Name - “anantaraspa.co.in”**

- That, the disputed domain name has been promoting, marketing and offering its spa services to potential customers and public at large, through the said domain.
- That, the Respondent is flagrantly and prominently using the Complainant’s famous brand and registered trademark, ANANTARA on their website. A snapshot of the Respondent’s website is pasted below:



Why choose Anantara



- That, owing to the Complainant’s global popularity and impeccable reputation, the Respondent has adopted and is using the Complainant’s well-reputed brand and trademark, ANANTARA. The Respondent has no reason to adopt the same for providing allied and overlapping services, establishing the malicious intentions and dishonest adoption of the Complainant’s trademark.
- That, the Respondent has wantonly adopted the impugned domain incorporating ‘ANANTARA’ which is identical to the Complainant’s famous, registered and earlier trademark and trade name and the mala fide adoption of the impugned domain is a

Ananta

blatant violation of the Complainant's valuable rights in the well-known, registered and earlier mark ANANTARA, since any use of the trademark and trade name ANANTARA as a company name and/ or in any other manner whatsoever is likely to cause confusion and deception amongst the purchasing public and members of the trade. Therefore, the Complainant has been constrained to initiate the subject proceedings.

6. 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 Domain Name is identical and/or confusingly similar to a name, trademark, or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

- The Complainant's famous brand and registered mark ANANTARA is being used in the domain as <https://anantaraspa.co.in/> and is apparent that the Respondent has given significant emphasis on the Complainant's mark, thereby giving the impression that the Respondent is in fact, ANANTARA.
- The Complainant enjoys both statutory and common law rights qua the trademark ANANTARA in India and throughout the world and the Respondent has adopted the Complainant's trademark as part of the impugned domain, company name and trading style, in respect of allied and overlapping services.
- The modus operandi of the Respondent to misrepresent the consumers is apparent from the fact that the Respondent has adopted and is using the impugned identity of 'Anantara Spa' and is using the same, as part of the impugned domain to piggy ride the Complainant's immense goodwill and reputation.
- The Complainant had registered the domain name, www.anantara.com in the year 2000, and thus has much prior, continuous and extensive use of its well-known brand and trademark, even in terms of online presence.

B. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name

- There is no credible or legitimate reason for the Respondent to have chosen to adopt a domain name consisting of the identical 'ANANTARA' mark but with the sole intention to use the fame of the Complainant's ANANTARA Trademarks to generate web traffic and confuse the internet users and public at large.
- The Respondent has registered and using the impugned domain to attract internet users who will believe that the Respondent's services have been authorized and/or licensed



by the Complainant, misrepresent the relevant users and pass off its services as that of the Complainant and misappropriate the Complainant's reputation, goodwill and customer loyalty for its own wrongful profits.

C. **The Domain is being Registered and/or used in Bad Faith**

- The Respondent has deliberately registered the impugned domain and is flagrantly using the Complainant's trademark on its website, to create public confusion as to the source of the services.
- The Respondent has illegally adopted and is using the impugned domain/website to pass off their services under the garb of being the Complainant itself or an entity, affiliated, associated or endorsed by the Complainant. The Respondent is causing severe losses to the users/consumers, who may use the Respondent's services under a belief that the same are provided by the Complainant and thereby duping them off heavy monetary losses.
- The Respondent can have no plausible explanation as to how it came to adopt the impugned domain in the first place expect to have picked up the Complainant's identical trademark ANANTARA in its entirety with a minor addition and making the same part of the domain name to draw an apparent association with them and to depict to the public at large that they are the authorized service provider, partner/affiliate or related entity for the Complainant when that is not the case.
- It is incomprehensible that the Respondent would have been unaware of the Complainant's brand and trademark ANANTARA at the time when the disputed domain name was registered, given the prominence and well-known stature of the Complainant's services under its house mark. This behaviour of the Respondent constitutes bad faith use and may tarnish the Complainant's reputation by *inter alia*, attracting internet users to a webpage that appears to be endorsed by the Complainant when there is no endorsement.

7. **Reliefs claimed by the Complainant**

The Complainant has requested that the domain name "anantaraspa.co.in" be transferred to them or cancelled and the award cost of the proceedings to the Complainant.

8. **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 and opportunities 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 the pendency of the arbitral proceedings in the captioned matter.

9. Discussion and Findings

As mentioned in Paragraph 4 of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, a 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. The Registrant's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name, trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

(Paragraph 4(a) of the INDRP)

- The Complainant has furnished information about their rights over the **ANANTARA trade marks** in several countries of the world including in India.
- The Complainant has also provided details of domain name, comprising its **ANANTARA trade mark** and provided evidence in respect of its prior adoption and use, as well as reputation in its **ANANTARA trade marks**.
- The Complainant has also submitted that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain <**anantaraspaco.in**> is bound to denote that the Respondent is associated with or is affiliated with the Complainant.
- It is a well settled principle in domain dispute matters, that trade mark registration is recognized as prima facie evidence of rights in a mark.
- In view of the documents and evidence placed on record by the Complainant, the Arbitrator finds that the Complainant has suitably demonstrated its rights in the ANANTARA trade marks.
- In this regard, it is pertinent to point out that it has been held by numerous prior INDRP panels that there exists confusing similarity wherein the disputed name incorporates the Complainant's trade mark, including but not limited to in the decisions in *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*

Arana

<Colgate.in>, The Singer Company Limited v. Novation In Limited INDRP/905 <singer.co.in>, Tata Digital Private Limited & Tata Sons Pvt Limited v. Miiraj Miiraj INDRP/1876, Radisson Hospitality Belgium BV/SRL v. NAJIM INDRP/1818, Tata Communications Limited v. Chandan [INDRP/1880], etc.

In view of the aforesaid, the Arbitrator finds that the Complainant has been successful in establishing their rights in the **ANANTARA trade marks**.

Accordingly, it may be stated that the disputed domain name **<anantaraspa.co.in>** is confusingly similar to the Complainant's **ANANTARA trade marks** 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. **The Registrant has no rights and legitimate interest in respect of the domain name (Paragraph 4(b) and Paragraph 6 of the INDRP)**

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 formal response from the Respondent within the time period provided, 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 Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the ANANTARA mark, nor to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the subject mark. Accordingly, the Respondent has no rights in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.
- The impugned website is fully operational and is bound to induce members of the public and trade to believe that the Respondent has trade connection, association, relationship, or approval of the Complainant, when it is not so.



In the present domain dispute, the Respondent has not joined the arbitral proceedings by the time-period, despite being duly served with the domain complaint, and consequently, not come forward with any assertion or evidence to show any bonafides has failed to satisfy the conditions enshrined in paragraph 6 of the INDRP Policy. As held by numerous prior panels, including recently in Case No. INDRP/1891 for <stanleyco.in>, “*the Complainant has to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, whereafter, the burden of proof on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.*”

The Complainant has established a prima facie case of its rights in the **ANANTARA marks**. 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. **The Registrant’s domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith and for illegal/ unlawful purpose**
(Paragraph 4(c) and Paragraph 7 of the INDRP)

In this regard, the Complainant has *inter alia* contended the following points regarding Respondent’s bad faith:

- Besides causing grave harm and loss of revenue and reputation to the Complainant, the Respondent is causing severe losses to the users/consumers, who may use the Respondent’s services, under a belief that the same are provided by the Complainant and thereby duping them off heavy monetary losses.
- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2025, which is identical to the Complainant’s **ANANTARA marks**. Thus, this conduct of intentional adoption of the identical domain name in order to attract internet users to the disputed domain and its website thereon with a view to derive unfair monetary advantage constitutes bad faith.

The Complainant has registration for **ANANTARA trademarks** (including



)dating back to 2000, which is well before the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name in 2025.

Arang

In view of the submissions of the Complainant, specifically the identicalness between the disputed domain name <**anantaraspaco.in**> and Complainant's ANANTARA trademarks coupled with the fact that the website is fully operational, Arbitrator finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name prima facie does not appear to be bona fide and appears to be intended to deceive the lay public and trade off on the Complainant's reputation. It is pertinent to mention, also, that the Respondent has not submitted any reply nor rebuttal to the Complainant's contentions, or evidence in support of its bona fide registration or use of the disputed domain name.

Based on the submissions and documents placed on record, it prima facie appears that the Respondent is engaged in conduct enumerated in paragraph 7(c) of the Policy, namely "*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.

10. Decision

Based upon the facts and circumstances, the Arbitrator allows the prayer of the Complainant and directs the .IN Registry to transfer the domain <**anantaraspaco.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 05, 2026

Place: New Delhi, India.