
PROTECTION OF DOMAIN NAMES UNDER INDIAN TRADEMARK LAW: A STUDY OF THE EXISTING LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Shatakshi Upadhyay, B.B.A. LL.B. (H.), Amity Law School, Amity University Patna

ABSTRACT

The growth of the Internet has transformed the way businesses establish their identity and interact with consumers. A domain name may function not merely as a technical address but also as a commercial identifier associated with the goodwill of a business. This has led to disputes where domain names conflict with existing trademarks or business identities.

Indian law does not contain separate comprehensive legislation exclusively governing domain names. Courts have nevertheless extended trademark principles, particularly passing off, to domain-name disputes. In *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, the Supreme Court recognised the commercial significance of domain names and their capacity to receive legal protection. The .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) also provides a specialised mechanism for disputes concerning .IN and .Bharat domain names.

This paper examines the relationship between domain names and trademarks under Indian law, the development of judicial protection, and the role of the INDRP in addressing cybersquatting. It further considers the limitations of the existing framework and suggests greater legal clarity and procedural coordination for strengthening domain-name protection in India.

Keywords: Domain Names, Trademarks, Passing Off, Cybersquatting, Trade Marks Act, 1999, INDRP, Intellectual Property.

I. INTRODUCTION

The emergence of the internet has changed the way commercial enterprises identify themselves. In the conventional marketplace, consumers generally associate a business with its name, logo, mark, packaging or other distinctive features. In the online environment, the domain name of a website can perform a comparable identifying function.¹

A consumer searching for a particular business may not begin with a physical establishment or even a conventional trademark. The consumer may instead enter the business's domain name into an internet browser. Consequently, the domain name can become closely associated with the reputation and goodwill of the enterprise behind it.²

This development has created a significant intersection between domain-name regulation and trademark law. A domain name which corresponds to a well-known trademark may be capable of attracting consumers to an unauthorised website. Similarly, a person may register a domain name containing another undertaking's distinctive mark and subsequently attempt to sell the domain name, divert customers or otherwise take advantage of the reputation attached to the mark. Such conduct is commonly described as cybersquatting.³

The difficulty for trademark law is that a domain name does not fit neatly within the traditional territorial model of trademark protection. A trademark is ordinarily protected through national legal systems, whereas a domain name can be accessed from virtually anywhere in the world. The Supreme Court of India expressly recognised this distinction in *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145.⁴

Indian legislation does not provide a comprehensive statutory code exclusively dealing with domain names. The Trade Marks Act, 1999 nevertheless provides important remedies where the use of a domain name amounts to trademark infringement or passing off. Section 27, in

¹ *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145

² *Id.*

³ .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, cls. 4, 7, .IN Registry, National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI).

⁴ *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145

particular, preserves the common-law remedy of passing off, while Sections 29 and 30 regulate infringement and limitations on the effect of registered trademarks respectively.⁵

Judicial decisions have therefore played an important role in filling the legal space surrounding domain names. Beginning with decisions such as *Yahoo Inc. v. Akash Arora* and *Rediff Communication Ltd. v. Cyberbooth*, and subsequently receiving authoritative recognition from the Supreme Court in *Satyam Infoway*, Indian courts have treated domain names as commercial identifiers capable of attracting legal protection.⁶

At the institutional level, the .IN Registry has also established the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP). The Policy governs disputes concerning .IN and .Bharat domain names and provides a mechanism through which a complainant can challenge a domain name on grounds including confusing similarity, absence of legitimate interest and bad-faith registration or use.⁷

The present paper examines these developments and considers whether the existing framework provides an adequate response to the protection of domain names in India.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The principal difficulty concerning domain-name protection in India arises from the absence of a specific and comprehensive statutory framework dealing exclusively with domain names and their disputes. The Supreme Court in *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions (P) Ltd.* recognised that Indian law contains no legislation specifically providing for the resolution of domain-name disputes.⁸

The existing legal position is instead developed through a combination of trademark law, the common law of passing off, judicial precedents and the administrative framework governing domain-name registration and dispute resolution. In particular, the Trade Marks Act, 1999 provides remedies relating to trademark infringement and preserves the remedy of passing

⁵ The Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47 of 1999, §§ 27(2), 29, 30 (India).

⁶ *Yahoo! Inc. v. Akash Arora*, 1999 SCC OnLine Del 133; (1999) 19 PTC 201 (Del.); *Rediff Communication Ltd. v. Cyberbooth*, AIR 2000 Bom 27; *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145.

⁷ .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, cls. 4–7, .IN Registry, National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI).

⁸ *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145.

off, while the INDRP provides a specialised mechanism for disputes concerning .IN and .Bharat domain names.⁹

This fragmented structure raises several questions. A domain name may be registered through a domain registrar, but its commercial significance may arise from the goodwill associated with a trademark, business name or other commercial identity. At same time, similarity between a domain name and a trademark cannot, by itself, necessarily establish unlawful conduct. The INDRP itself recognises circumstances in which a registrant may have rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.¹⁰

The challenge is therefore to develop a legal framework which protects genuine trademark rights without converting trademark protection into an unrestricted right over every corresponding domain name.

III. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The paper has the following objectives:

1. To examine the legal relationship between trademarks and domain names in India.
2. To analyse the protection available to domain names under the Trade Marks Act, 1999.
3. To examine the development of judicial principles governing domain-name disputes.
4. To study the application of the doctrine of passing off to domain names.
5. To analyse the functioning of the INDRP framework.
6. To examine the problem of cybersquatting in the Indian context.
7. To identify limitations in the existing legal framework and suggest possible improvements.

IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

⁹ The Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47 of 1999, §§ 27(2), 29, 30 (India); .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), cls. 2, 4, .IN Registry, National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI).

¹⁰ .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), cl. 6, .IN Registry, National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI).

The research proceeds on the basis of the following questions:

1. Can a domain name receive protection through Indian trademark law?
2. When can the unauthorised use of a domain name amount to passing off?
3. What principles have Indian courts developed for resolving domain-name disputes?
4. How does the INDRP supplement remedies available before Indian courts?
5. Does the present framework adequately address cybersquatting while preserving legitimate interests in domain names?

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper adopts a doctrinal method of legal research. It primarily relies upon statutes, judicial decisions, domain-name policies and institutional materials.

The Trade Marks Act, 1999 forms the principal statutory basis of the discussion. Judicial decisions of the Supreme Court and High Courts are examined to understand how traditional principles of trademark law and passing off have been applied to domain names.

The research also examines the **.IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy** and the **INDRP Rules of Procedure** issued by the .IN Registry. The current INDRP framework expressly governs disputes relating to .IN and .Bharat domain names.¹¹

The approach is primarily analytical. The objective is not simply to reproduce the existing legal position but to examine how effectively the existing principles respond to the particular characteristics of the internet.

VI. DOMAIN NAMES AND THEIR COMMERCIAL SIGNIFICANCE

¹¹ .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), cl. 2, .IN Registry, National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI).

A domain name is generally understood as the identifiable address through which an internet user accesses a website. From a technical standpoint, its principal function is locating a particular internet resource. Its commercial function, however, can be considerably wider.

Consider a consumer who wishes to purchase a product from a particular company. If the consumer enters the company's distinctive domain name into a browser, the domain name operates as an identifier of the commercial source of the website.

This makes domain names particularly valuable to businesses. A memorable and distinctive domain name can:

- identify a business;
- attract consumers;
- communicate commercial reputation;
- facilitate online transactions;
- distinguish one undertaking from another; and
- become associated with the goodwill of the business.

It is this commercial dimension that creates the connection between domain names and trademarks.

A domain name should not, however, be treated as automatically equivalent to a registered trademark. The legal significance of a domain name depends upon the circumstances in which it is used, the goodwill associated with it, the nature of the mark involved and the likelihood of confusion or deception.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.* is important in this context. The Court recognised that a domain name may possess characteristics of a trademark because, in the commercial environment, it can identify and

distinguish a business, its goods or its services. The Court further recognised that the deceptive use of a domain name may give rise to an action for passing off.¹²

VII. TRADEMARK LAW AND DOMAIN NAMES IN INDIA

The Trade Marks Act, 1999

The Trade Marks Act, 1999 does not establish a separate statutory category of “domain-name rights.” Nevertheless, several provisions of the Act become relevant where a domain name incorporates, reproduces or conflicts with a trademark.¹³

Section 27(2) is particularly significant because it expressly preserves the right of action for passing off. This is important in cases where protection is sought for goodwill and reputation even though the claim may not fall within the statutory remedy for infringement of a registered trademark.¹⁴

Section 29 deals with infringement of registered trademarks. Depending upon the circumstances, the use in the course of trade of a mark which is identical with or deceptively similar to a registered trademark may constitute infringement where the statutory requirements of the provision are satisfied.¹⁵

Section 30 sets out limitations on the effect of a registered trademark. It recognises circumstances in which the use of a registered trademark does not constitute infringement, including certain uses made in accordance with honest practices and specified descriptive or other permissible uses.¹⁶

The application of these provisions to domain names depends upon the facts of each case, including the nature and use of the domain name and the likelihood of confusion or deception.

VIII. PASSING OFF AND DOMAIN NAMES

¹² *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145

¹³ The Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47 of 1999, §§ 27(2), 29, 30 (India)

¹⁴ The Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47 of 1999, § 27(2) (India).

¹⁵ The Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47 of 1999, § 29 (India).

¹⁶ The Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47 of 1999, § 30 (India).

The doctrine of passing off is particularly significant in domain-name disputes because it protects goodwill and reputation rather than merely the registration of a trademark.

The traditional elements of passing off may broadly be understood through three components:

Goodwill

The claimant must establish goodwill or reputation associated with the relevant name, mark or commercial identity.

Misrepresentation

There must be a representation which is likely to lead, or has led, members of the public to believe that the defendant's goods, services or business are connected with the claimant.

Damage

The claimant must establish actual or probable damage to its goodwill or business as a consequence of the misrepresentation.

The application of these principles to the internet is particularly important because consumers may reach a website solely by relying upon a domain name. A deceptively similar domain name may therefore create confusion even before the consumer has examined the actual content of the website.

The Supreme Court has reiterated that misrepresentation in passing-off law does not necessarily require proof of a dishonest intention. The focus remains on the effect of the representation and the resulting likelihood of damage.

This principle is particularly relevant to domain-name disputes because a trademark owner should not necessarily be required to prove the subjective intention of the registrant before obtaining protection against a misleading use.

IX. EARLY INDIAN JUDICIAL APPROACH

IX. I YAHOO INC. V. AKASH ARORA (1999)

In *Yahoo! Inc. v. Akash Arora*, (1999) 19 PTC 201 (Del.), the Hon'ble Delhi High Court dealt with the use of a domain name incorporating the expression "Yahoo". The Court applied the principles of passing off and recognised the possibility of confusion arising from the use of a deceptively similar domain name. The decision demonstrated that traditional passing-off principles could be applied to disputes arising from emerging Internet-based commercial activities.¹⁷

IX.II REDIFF COMMUNICATION LTD. V. CYBERBOOTH (2000)

In *Rediff Communication Ltd. v. Cyberbooth*, AIR 2000 Bom 27, the Hon'ble Bombay High Court considered the use of a domain name incorporating the expression "Rediff". The Court applied passing-off principles to protect the commercial identity and goodwill associated with the plaintiff's name. The decision further established the relevance of traditional trademark principles to domain-name disputes.¹⁸

IX.III SATYAM INFOWAY LTD. V. SIFFYNET SOLUTIONS (P) LTD.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court's decision in *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145, provided authoritative recognition of the protection available to domain names under Indian law. The Court held that a domain name may possess the characteristics of a trademark and that its deceptive use may give rise to an action for passing off.

The Court also recognised the difficulty created by the territorial nature of trademark law in an Internet environment where domain names may be accessed across geographical boundaries. Nevertheless, where a domain name has acquired goodwill and reputation, existing legal principles may provide protection against its deceptive use.¹⁹

X. DEVELOPMENT OF INDIAN JURISPRUDENCE

Following *Satyam Infoway*, Indian courts have increasingly treated domain-name disputes within the broader framework of trademark infringement and passing off. Courts have

¹⁷ *Yahoo! Inc. v. Akash Arora*, (1999) 19 PTC 201 (Del.).

¹⁸ *Rediff Communication Ltd. v. Cyberbooth*, AIR 2000 Bom 27.

¹⁹ *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145.

granted injunctions where the use of a domain name is likely to mislead consumers or exploit the goodwill associated with an established mark.

The protection is particularly significant where the disputed domain name is identical or deceptively similar to a recognised trademark and is being used for competing or commercially connected activities.

Thus, Indian jurisprudence has gradually moved towards recognising the commercial identity and goodwill attached to domain names.

XI. CYBERSQUATTING

Cybersquatting generally refers to the registration or use of a domain name corresponding to another person's trademark or business name, particularly with an intention to benefit from the goodwill associated with it.

Common forms include:

- registering a well-known trademark as a domain name;
- offering the domain for sale to the trademark owner;
- diverting Internet users to another website; and
- using a deceptively similar domain name to create consumer confusion.

Depending upon the circumstances, cybersquatting may be addressed through trademark law, passing off and the INDRP.

XII. INDIAN DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY (INDRP)

The .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) provides a mechanism for resolving disputes concerning .IN and .Bharat domain names.

Under Clause 4, a complainant must establish that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name, trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; that the registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and that

the domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith or for an unlawful purpose.²⁰

The INDRP therefore provides a specialised mechanism for resolving qualifying domain-name disputes through arbitration.

XIII. LEGITIMATE INTEREST OF THE REGISTRANT

Not every registration of a domain name similar to a trademark amount to infringement or cybersquatting. A registrant may have a legitimate interest where the domain name is genuinely used for a bona fide offering of goods or services, is commonly associated with the registrant, or is used for legitimate non-commercial purposes.

Therefore, the circumstances surrounding registration and use must be examined before concluding that a domain name has been wrongfully obtained.

XIV. BAD FAITH

Bad faith is an important element in cybersquatting disputes. It may be indicated by circumstances such as:

- registration primarily to sell the domain to the trademark owner;
- preventing the trademark owner from obtaining the corresponding domain name;
- registration primarily to disrupt a competitor; or
- intentionally attracting users by creating confusion with another mark.

The existence of bad faith must be determined from the facts and surrounding circumstances of each case.

XV. PROCEDURE UNDER INDRP

²⁰ .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), cl. 4, .IN Registry, National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI).

The INDRP provides a structured mechanism for resolving disputes concerning .IN and .Bharat domain names. Proceedings begin with the filing of a complaint with the .IN Registry, followed by service upon the respondent. The Registry appoints an Arbitrator from its empanelled list, who considers the pleadings and evidence and determines the dispute in accordance with the INDRP and applicable Rules.²¹

XVI. REMEDIES

Under Clause 11 of the INDRP, the principal remedies are cancellation or transfer of the disputed domain name. Costs may also be awarded by the Arbitrator.²²

Where broader relief, such as an injunction or damages, is sought, the concerned party may pursue remedies before a competent court under applicable trademark or passing-off law.

XVII. COURTS AND INDRP: DISTINCT FUNCTIONS

The INDRP and the courts operate through different legal mechanisms. The INDRP provides a specialised procedure for resolving disputes concerning .IN domain names, particularly cases involving cybersquatting and bad-faith registration. Indian courts, on the other hand, have wider jurisdiction to examine questions of trademark infringement, passing off, damages and other civil remedies. Therefore, the INDRP serves as an additional dispute-resolution mechanism and does not eliminate the jurisdiction of the courts.

XVIII. TERRITORIALITY AND THE INTERNET

Trademark rights are traditionally territorial, whereas domain names are accessible across geographical boundaries. This creates difficulties when online activities extend beyond the jurisdiction in which trademark rights arise. The Supreme Court in *Satyam Infoway* recognised this tension and considered the territorial nature of trademark law in the context of the Internet.²³

²¹ .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), cl. 5; INDRP Rules of Procedure, cls. 3, 5, .IN Registry, National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI).

²² .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP), cl. 11, .IN Registry, National Internet Exchange of India (NIXI).

²³ *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145

XIX. CRITICAL ANALYSIS

The Indian legal framework provides protection against the misuse of domain names through trademark law, the common law of passing off and the INDRP. Judicial decisions have played an important role in recognising the commercial value of domain names and protecting them against deceptive use.

At the same time, India does not have a separate comprehensive legislation dealing exclusively with domain-name disputes. Questions relating to jurisdiction, cross-border enforcement and the changing nature of online commercial activity may therefore require continued judicial and administrative development. The existing framework provides remedies, but its effectiveness depends substantially on the application of established trademark principles to new forms of digital conduct.

XX. SUGGESTIONS

The protection of domain names in India can be strengthened through greater legal clarity regarding their relationship with trademark rights. The dispute-resolution process may also be made more efficient through better coordination between domain registrars and relevant intellectual property authorities. Greater awareness among businesses regarding timely domain-name and trademark registration can further reduce disputes. Since domain-name disputes frequently involve parties operating across different jurisdictions, international cooperation and effective cross-border enforcement mechanisms are also important.

XXI. CONCLUSION

Domain names have become important commercial identifiers, and their similarity to established trademarks may cause consumer confusion and misuse of business goodwill.

The decision in *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Siffynet Solutions (P) Ltd.* recognised the commercial significance of domain names and extended passing-off protection to their deceptive use. The INDRP further provides a specialised mechanism for resolving disputes concerning .IN and .Bharat domain names.

Although the existing framework provides legal protection, technological developments, territorial issues and cross-border enforcement continue to require attention. Greater legal clarity and procedural coordination would strengthen domain-name protection in India.