



INDIA NON JUDICIAL

Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi

e-Stamp

Certificate No.

: IN-DL96441034570959X

Certificate Issued Date

: 19-Nov-2025 03:11 PM

Account Reference

: IMPACC (IV)/ dl729603/ DELHI/ DL-ESD

Unique Doc. Reference

: SUBIN-DLLDL72960320164460719903X

Purchased by

: VIDYA PRAKASH PATHAK

Description of Document

: Article 12 Award

Property Description

: Not Applicable

Consideration Price (Rs.)

: 0
(Zero)

First Party

: VIDYA PRAKASH PATHAK

Second Party

: Not Applicable

Stamp Duty Paid By

: VIDYA PRAKASH PATHAK

Stamp Duty Amount(Rs.)

: 100
(One Hundred only)



Please write or type below this line

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

V.P.Pathak

Statutory Alert:

1. The authenticity of this Stamp certificate should be verified at www.stampit.com or using e-Stamp Mobile App of Stock Holding Any discrepancy in the details on this Certificate and as available on the website / Mobile App renders it invalid
2. The onus of checking the legitimacy is on the users of the certificate

* In case of any discrepancy please inform the Government Authority

**BEFORE THE .IN REGISTRY OF INDIA
INDRP CASE NO. 2081**
**IN THE MATTER OF AN ARBITRATION UNDER THE .IN DOMAIN NAME
DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY; THE INDRP RULES OF PROCEDURE
AND THE ARBITRATION CONCILIATION ACT, 1996**

INDEX

S.NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1.	Disputed Domain name and Registrar	2
2.	Arbitration Tribunal	2-3
3.	Facts of the case	3-6
4.	Conclusion	6-7
5.	Order	7

V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator

**BEFORE THE .IN REGISTRY OF INDIA
INDRP CASE NO. 2081**
**IN THE MATTER OF AN ARBITRATION UNDER THE .IN DOMAIN NAME
DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY; THE INDRP RULES OF PROCEDURE
AND THE ARBITRATION CONCILIATION ACT, 1996**

Indeed, Inc.
 Austin Indeed Tower
 200 West 6th Street
 Austin, Texas 78701
 United States of America

....Complainant

Versus

Nalin Pandey
 E01 Swastik Apartment
 Vishwas Park, Uttam Nagar
 New Delhi, Delhi – 110059

....Respondent

**DISPUTE RELATING IN THE DOMAIN DISPUTE NAME
www.indeedcareer.in**

Award Dated- 14.01.2026

**BEFORE V.P. PATHAK
 SOLE ARBITRATOR
 AT NEW DELHI**

DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME & REGISTRAR-

1. The disputed domain name is registered through the Registrar of the disputed domain name HOSTINGER abuse@hostinger.com ; domains@hostinger.com, which is accredited with the .IN registry and is listed on the website of the .IN registry.

V. P. PATHAK
 H.J.S.
 Former Judge
 Sole Arbitrator


ARBITRATION TRIBUNAL-

2. The Complainant has filed this Complaint for the disputed domain name, to be transferred to it. To decide this Complaint, NIXI has appointed the undersigned as Arbitrator. A consent letter with a declaration of impartiality by the undersigned to decide this case was sent to NIXI on 29.12.2025.
3. The Tribunal primarily ordered the Complainant on 31.12.2025, to send the soft & hard copy of the Complaint along with annexures to the Respondent & to send the Postal Slip of the same to the Tribunal. The Complainant complied with the order & on 2.01.2026, provided the soft & hard copy of the Complaint to the by Courier, the receipt of which was sent on the same day by the Complainant.
4. As per **Rule 5 of the INDRP Rules** the Tribunal issued a notice dated 7.01.2026 calling upon the Respondent to file its reply on the Complaint within fifteen days from the date of receipt of the notice and rejoinder within fifteen days thereafter.
5. On 9.01.2026, the Respondent replied to the Notice email sent by the Tribunal, asking for voluntary transfer or cancellation of the domain name as he had set up this domain for a client and not for himself.
6. The Tribunal is constituted under the INDRP Policy and Rules. Under rule 13, the arbitration proceedings must be conducted according to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 2019 (as amended up to date) read with the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, Rules, Dispute Resolution Policy and its by-laws, and guidelines, as amended from time to time.
7. As mentioned above, the Respondent has replied to the order sent to both the parties through email. Based on the facts of the case the Tribunal will decide the present Award.

FACTS OF THE CASE-

8. With specific reference to India, the Complainant owns and operates the domain <https://in.indeed.com/>, dedicated to connecting job seekers with prospective employers in India. The Complainant regularly launches innovative new hiring products in India, such as its 2025 launch of AI-powered sourcing and specialist media networks in India.
9. The Complainant has placed on record material demonstrating its business identity, history, and long-standing presence in the online recruitment and employment services sector. The records show that the Complainant owns & commenced its online operations in the year 2004, and since continuously operated digital platforms facilitating job search, recruitment, and hiring services for jobseekers and employers across multiple jurisdictions. (**Annexure 3**)
10. In support of its claim of reputation and goodwill, the Complainant has relied upon extracts of web articles, media coverage, and publicly available material highlighting the scale of its operations, market reach, and public association with employment and recruitment services. According to the Complainant, these materials demonstrate that the mark **INDEED** enjoys wide recognition among internet users and members of the trade. (**Annexure 4**)

11. The Complainant has also placed on record material evidencing awards, recognitions, and industry acknowledgements received over the years, including international and sector-specific awards & was also named “Brand That Matters” in 2022 by Fast Company, which recognizes companies that are “leading on social action, sustainability, inclusivity, and fun”. **(Annexure 5)**
12. The Complainant has further relied upon documentary material evidencing its statutory rights in the trademark INDEED and associated service marks. The Complainant owns and has used the brand and trademark INDEED and variations thereof for over *two decades* in relation to its highly successful job websites and search engines, as well as related goods and services such as mobile applications and online advertising services. As per the Complainant, it is the registered proprietor of these trademarks in India and other jurisdictions, covering services relating to employment search, recruitment, and allied online offerings. **(Annexure 6)**
13. The Complainant has also placed on record material relating to its official domain name and online presence. The documents show that the Complainant has consistently used its trademark as part of its digital identity and that its official website has functioned as a principal interface for users seeking employment-related information and services over several years. **(Annexure 3)**
14. The Complainant owns the domain name <indeed.com> and operates its corresponding primary website at www.indeed.com, through which it conducts a significant portion of its business and where information about Indeed and its business is easily accessible and available to millions of internet users, who may be current or potential consumers. As is evident, the Complainant’s domain name incorporates its registered trademark INDEED in its entirety, thus further augmenting its proprietary rights in the said mark. The above-mentioned domain name <indeed.com>, as evident, is based on the corporate name of the Complainant’s company, Indeed, Inc., and was created/registered on and has been regularly renewed since 30.03.1998. **(Annexure 7)**
15. The Complainant is also the owner of the India specific domain <indeed.co.in>, which was created / registered on and has been regularly renewed since 14.12.2006. It is pertinent to note that Indian users are redirected from the Complainant’s website at www.indeed.com to www.in.indeed.com. **(Annexure 8)**
16. As a result of and to leverage its internet-based business model, the Complainant has also set up several other dedicated country-specific domain names and websites in major markets such as Australia <indeed.com.au>, Canada <indeed.ca>, France <indeed.fr>, Hong Kong <indeed.hk>, Japan <indeed.jp>, Mexico<indeed.com.mx> etc. The Complainant is also the owner of several other domain names containing its registered trademark INDEED, e.g. <indeed.blog>, <indeed.career>, <indeed.design>, <indeed.expert> etc. **(Annexure 9 & 10)**
17. Besides its websites, the Complainant’s INDEED Marks and services and goods thereunder are prominently advertised on major social networking sites such as Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn etc. Given the fact that these websites attract masses from every social, geographical, economic, and age demographic worldwide, the INDEED Marks have consequently been exposed to an exponentially large section of both Indian and international public. Further, in order to meet customer needs and ease of accessibility, the Complainant also makes its services available to the public *via* its mobile applications on


 V. P. PATHAK
 H.J.S.
 Former Judge
 Sole Arbitrator

the two most prominent mobile platforms in the world - Apple (App Store) and Android (Google Play Store). (**Annexure 11 & 12**)

18. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates its trademark INDEED in its entirety, together with the word “career”, which directly relates to the nature of services for which the Complainant is widely known. The material placed on record shows that the disputed domain name was configured for online presence and was capable of being accessed by internet users. (**Annexure 13**)
19. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name did not remain merely dormant and that its configuration was capable of diverting internet traffic intended for the Complainant or creating an impression of association or affiliation. According to the Complainant, such use is sufficient to cause confusion among users seeking employment-related services.
20. The Complainant has also pointed out that the disputed domain name does not prominently disclose any disclaimer clarifying that it is unaffiliated with the Complainant. It is contended that the absence of such clarification enhances the likelihood that internet users may assume a connection or association with the Complainant’s services.
21. In support of its contentions, the Complainant has relied upon various judicial and arbitral decisions under domain name dispute resolution frameworks, wherein it has been recognised that the adoption of a well-known trademark as part of a domain name, even with the addition of descriptive or generic terms, may give rise to confusion and misleading association & the same can be found in the Complaint. In the INDRP order *Indeed, Inc. v. Indeedworld <indeedworld.in> (INDRP/931)* passed in January 2018, the Learned Arbitrator in its decision had stated: “... it is well settled proposition that when the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of any generic or common language term would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of UDRP Policy”. Copies of a few orders passed by NIXI, WIPO, and Forum are collectively enclosed as **Annexure 14**.
22. In addition to the decisions relied upon by the Complainant, reference may be made to decisions under the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, including *Google India Pvt. Ltd. v. Hemant Kumar & Tata Sons Ltd. v. Manu Kosuri & Ors.*, wherein it has been recognised that the use of a well-known trademark in a domain name, with the addition of descriptive elements, does not necessarily dispel confusion or negate the likelihood of misleading association.
23. Given the Complainant’s extensive international presence in the recruitment and employment sector, the incorporation of the term “career” alongside the mark INDEED is likely to strengthen, rather than weaken, the impression of association. Such composition is apt to lead internet users to believe that the disputed domain name relates to a dedicated career platform or service operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.
24. The Complainant has filed the instant Complaint challenging the registration of the domain name www.indeedcareer.in under the “.in” Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) and the rules framed thereunder. The Complainant has preferred this arbitration by raising this dispute for the resolution of its grievances.
25. **Rule 2 of the INDRP Rules of Procedure** provides for communication/services of the Complaint. Per this rule, the Respondent was sent a copy of the Complaint at the email shown in the domain name registration data in the .IN Registry’s WHOIS database.

26. The disputed domain name <indeedcareer.in> was registered on 11.07.2025 by the Respondent. The Complainant submits that the registration of the disputed domain name post-dates its adoption, registration, and extensive use of its trademark and domain name by several years. (**Annexure 2**)
27. The Respondent is recorded as the registrant of the disputed domain name. During the pendency of the proceedings, the Respondent addressed communications by way of emails dated 9.01.2026, stating that he had acted only as a developer for a client and that the disputed domain name had been created for such client. The Respondent further stated that the client was no longer responding to communications.
28. On the same date, the Respondent sent a subsequent email confirming his consent for voluntary transfer or cancellation of the disputed domain name <indeedcareer.in>, expressing his intention to bring the matter to a closure. These communications have been placed on record.
29. The Respondent has not placed on record any independent proprietary right, competing trademark claim, or material asserting a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. The communications on record indicate that the Respondent does not seek to retain the disputed domain name and has expressed willingness to relinquish the same.
30. The mere addition of the word "career" to the Complainant's trademark does not create a meaningful distinction, particularly where the added term directly corresponds to the Complainant's core area of activity. In a domain name, the portion appearing immediately before a Top-Level Domain such as ".com" or ".in" is commonly referred to as the Second-Level Domain (SLD), and it is this portion that internet users primarily notice and associate with the source of the website. In the present case, the incorporation of the Complainant's trademark together with the term "career" in the SLD does not dispel confusion; on the contrary, it is capable of strengthening the impression that the disputed domain name relates to an official or authorised career-related platform of the Complainant.
31. The above factual matrix, as emerging from the Complaint, and annexures placed on record, the WHOIS records, and the communications received from the Respondent, forms the basis for the present proceedings under the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy.

CONCLUSION-

32. Considering the above facts, the Tribunal is of the view that since the Respondent has acknowledged its mistake as soon as the Complaint was sent to it, & that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent, who was only acting as a developer for a client.
33. The Respondent immediately took action and requested the Tribunal and the .IN Registry voluntarily consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name.
34. In addition to everything mentioned above, it is pertinent to mention that the Respondent is not using the Complainant's domain name anymore and that the domain was created only for a client.
35. The Complainant has the full right and ownership of the domain name "INDEED" & "indeedcareer.in."

V. P' PATHAK
 H.J.S.
 Former Judge
 Sole Arbitrator
 VP Pathak

36. In the interests of natural justice, the Tribunal is of the view that since the Respondent has voluntarily taken the action of surrendering the domain name, the complaint should be allowed.
37. This Award is being passed as per Clause 5 (e) of the INDRP Rules, and Arbitration Act, 1996.

ORDER-

1. The IN Registry of NIXI is directed to transfer the disputed domain name "INDEEDCAREER.IN", if so far not deleted or transferred, to the Complainant forthwith. Registry to do the needful.
2. Parties to bear their own costs.
3. This Award is passed today at New Delhi on 14.01.2026.


V. P. PATHAK
H.J.S.
Former Judge
Sole Arbitrator
V.P.Pathak
Sole Arbitrator
Date- 14.01.2026