BLIND FOLD LEGAL JOURNAL

VOLUME 3 ISSUE 2
[SEP. 2023 – NOV. 2023]

E-mail: blindfoldjournal@gmail.com
Website: www.blindfoldjournal.com

"GUIDING THROUGH TRADEMARK CONFLICTS: A VITAL ROLE FOR ADR IN DOMAIN NAMES"

-Author: Shruti Jhinkwan & Dr. Seema Gupta

ABSTRACT:

This research study investigates the issues that arise when trademarks and domain names clash in our digital environment. We explore how Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) strategies can help to resolve these issues. Domain names are essential assets for businesses nowadays since they assist a lot with Internet promotion. Consider them virtual trademarks on the internet. Domain names, like trademarks in the real world, identify and represent businesses online.
But there's a catch. Unlike trademarks, which may be used by several owners for diverse purposes, a domain name can only belong to one person or a business. This has resulted in some conflict between people who hold trademarks and those who own domain names. This issue has resulted in disputes between the owners of traditional trademarks and those who control the matching domain names in the realm of Internet commerce.
As more companies move online, some people have taken advantage of the situation in the wrong way. Various governments have attempted to address these challenges. The Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act was enacted in the United States, while other nations relied on their usual trademark rules. These rules, however, have issues since it is difficult for national laws to line up with both national trademarks and international domain names. Since national regulations were not enough, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) established a method for worldwide problem resolution. The policy is known as the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP). This is a mechanism for resolving disputes, similar to arbitration.

Furthermore, each country has its procedure for resolving difficulties with the top-level domains that it manages. However, both the UDRP and the national systems have flaws. They approach all problems in the same manner and do not provide a single good solution. It may be problematic when people register domain names that are confusingly similar to existing trademarks. This happens frequently because various persons may desire to utilize the same brand. Dealing with these problems requires a different strategy than simply following the law. Instead, employing alternate means such as mediation, conciliation, and negotiation to reach an amicable settlement becomes critical. Consider a domain name dispute between two persons or corporations. Instead of immediately rushing to court, consider talking things out and coming to an agreement. We may learn from the World Trade Organization, which manages trade disputes through a combination of judicial rulings and conversations to identify common ground.

INTRODUCTION:

In an ideal society where people never make errors, there may be no need for laws or external authority to assess human behavior. Unfortunately, everyone makes mistakes. People frequently violate the rights of others in the pursuit of self-interest. In a society with such people, the court is critical in evaluating whether someone's acts are innocent or criminal. When problems emerge, people put their faith in the legal system. However, due to the slow pace of justice delivery, many people are afraid of seeking settlement through the courts. This delay is due to several causes, including the shortage of skilled judges, inadequately represented counsel, complex processes, needless adjournments, and a large number of ongoing cases. In certain cases, the delay is so protracted that the remedy offered by the courts is rendered ineffective owing to intervening circumstances. This condition undermines trust in the judicial system and makes individuals unwilling to seek redress through the courts.[1]

Going to court is not only time-consuming but also costly. This makes it difficult for poor individuals to access the judicial system. People do not necessarily want beautiful courtrooms with robed judges to address their problems; they just want a quick and inexpensive answer. As a result of these challenges, individuals began to explore alternatives to coming to court. As a result, other approaches like as arbitration, mediation, conciliation, negotiation, and Lok Adalats were developed. These are referred to as Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) procedures. ADR has grown in popularity because it allows individuals to get justice without the significant expenses and delays associated with regular court processes. This is true for all types of confrontations, from minor disagreements to corporate disputes. ADR is particularly useful in settling issues with domain names and trademarks.[2]

Using ADR (Alternative Dispute Resolution) to resolve disputes between domain names and trademarks is critical since traditional courts frequently fail to resolve these issues. This is because these issues affect several countries, and traditional legal systems only address one

[1] In Mahabir Jute Mills v. Shibban Lal Saxena AIR 1975 SC 2057, the final decision on the dismissal of workers took 25 years from the date of dismissal. The majority of 400 workmen who claimed justice had died before the decision.

[2] Justice Warren E. Burger, Former Chief Justice, United States Supreme Court. Last visited, 11 June 2008.
The Malimath Committee (1989) on Arrears in Court also underlined the need for alternative dispute resolution mechanisms such as mediation, conciliation, arbitration, Lok Adalats, etc as viable alternatives to conventional court litigation. This recommendation was made to reduce litigation and make justice readily accessible to the people at a minimum cost of time and money. N. V. Paranjape, Law Relating to Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution in India, Third edition, (Allahabad: Central Law Agency, 2006) p. 264.
Nomita Aggarwal, „Alternative Dispute Resolution: Concept and Concerns", Nyaya Deep, Vol. VII, Issue 1, January 2006, pp. 68 - 81 at p. 69.

country at a time. Furthermore, the typical judicial process takes a long time, and it is critical to resolve domain name and trademark disputes swiftly to avoid large damages. ADR is beneficial since it provides for a more flexible approach, which the standard legal system cannot supply.

DOMAIN NAME: ORIGIN AND MEANING

The Internet is a fun method for individuals all over the world to communicate with one another. Domain names are extremely significant in today's internet environment[3]. They're the must-have item in cyberspace, which is just a fancy phrase for the internet. Consider the Internet to be a massive web of interconnected computers[4]. Each computer on this web is assigned a unique electronic address, similar to a phone number. This address is known as an Internet Protocol (IP) address; however, it is simply a lengthy string of digits.[5]

People devised a way to make these numbers easier to recall. They developed a system known as Domain Name System (DNS)[6]. This approach uses words or characters rather than numbers, making it far easier for humans to memorize. So, a domain name is essentially a word-based or alphabet-based replacement for numerical IP addresses. It's similar to giving a location in the internet world a name that people can comprehend and remember[7].

Consider domain names to be the internet addresses for websites. When you access a website by typing a domain name, such as "search.msn.co.in," a server converts it into a specific numerical code known as an IP address, such as "207.46.176.53." This is how the domain name system operates. It's similar to checking up a friend's name in a phone book to get their phone number before calling them.[8]

TRADEMARK SAFEGUARDS: DEFINING THE PROTECTIVE MEASURES

[3] Paul Sugden, „Trademarks and Domain Names" in Jay Forder and Patrick Quirk (eds.), Electronic Commerce and the Law, (Australia: John Wiley & Sons, 2001) pp. 199 - 225 at p. 199.
[4] Peter B. Maggs, et al., Internet and Computer Law: Cases – Comments – Questions, (St. Paul, MN: West Group, 2001) p. 457.
[5] Rahul Matthan, The Law Relating to Computers and the Internet, (New Delhi: Butterworths, 2000) p. 372.
[6] Parul Kumar, „Domain Name Disputes and Cyber Squatting: Can Arbitration Suffice as a Way of Resolution?"
[7] Michael Froomkin, „ICANN"s "Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy" – Causes and (Partial) Cures", Brooklyn Law Review, Vol. 67, No. 3, 2002, pp. 605 - 718 at p. 615.
Michael Chissick and Alistair Kelman, Electronic Commerce: Law and Practice, (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1999) p. 17.
[8] 1 Pankaj Jain and Pandey Sangeet Rai, Copyright and Trademarks Laws Relating to Computers, First edition, (Lucknow: Eastern Book Company, 2005) p. 89.
Sourabh Ghosh, „Domain Name Disputes and Evaluation of the ICANN" 's Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy", Journal of Intellectual Property Rights, Vol. 9, September 2004, pp. 424 - 439 at p. 425.

Trademarks are an example of well-known intellectual property rights. Briefly stated, a trademark is a term, name, slogan, design, symbol, or sign that distinguishes one company's goods or services from those of another. According to the Trade Marks Act of 1999 in India, a trademark is something visibly presented that differentiates one person's goods or services from those of another. This includes product form, packaging, colors, and even certification and collective markings. A trademark's main purpose is to identify the source of goods or services. In layman's terms, it helps customers determine who created a product or delivered a service. Consider trademarks to be silent salesmen, establishing a direct connection between customers and the firm that owns the trademark.[9]

A trademark grants the exclusive right to use a certain mark, enhancing a company's reputation. This exclusivity also prevents others from duping consumers into believing they have a link with the firm that owns a certain trademark. A trademark's value increases over time as it gets more popular. In simple terms, trademarks allow businesses to differentiate themselves, develop customer trust, and prevent others from generating misunderstandings about their products or services.[10] From an economic point of view, everyone in business wants to keep its trademark, just like any other valuable asset it possesses. The laws and regulations for protecting trademarks differ from country to country[11]. Some states insist on legally registering trademarks to provide protection, whilst others, particularly in common law countries, acknowledge the value of a well-known brand name. In some nations, simply having a trade name connected with a specific product or service is enough to get some type of protection, according to a legal concept known as "passing off."

This is especially true if the trade name is well-known in that country and has a good track record. Unregistered trademarks, for example, are protected under Section 27(2) of the Indian Trade Marks Act 1999.[12]

[9] See Sharon K. Black, Telecommunications Law in the Internet Age, (San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann, 2002) p. 407.

[10] H. Brian Holland, „Tempest in a Teapot or Tidal Wave? Cybersquatting Rights and Remedies Run Amok", Journal of Technology Law and Policy, Vol. 10, 2005, pp. 301 - 351 at p. 338.
T. G. Agitha, „Trademark Dilution: Indian Approach", Journal of Indian Law Institute, July - September 2008, Vol. 50, No. 3, pp. 339 - 366 at p. 341
Vinod Sople, Managing Intellectual Property - The Strategic Imperative, (New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India, 2006) p. 229.

[11] Graeme B. Dinwoodie, „(National) Trademark Laws and the (Non-National) Domain Name System", David Vaver (ed.), Intellectual Property Rights - Critical Concepts in Law, Vol. IV, (London: Routledge, 2006) pp. 143 - 165 at p. 145

[12] Sec. 27: No action for infringement of unregistered trademark –

The registration of a trademark protects within the nation in which it is registered. If a business operates across numerous countries, it must register the trademark in each nation individually to ensure protection. Some nations, however, may recognize passing off, making registration less necessary. In general, registering trademarks is a good idea since it gives more clear and consistent legal protection across borders. Even in nations where passing off is legal, it is advantageous. What counts most in trademark infringement is the possibility of customer misunderstanding. If a third party uses a trademark in a way that causes consumer confusion, the trademark owner has the right to sue.[13] It is acceptable for more than one individual or business to possess the same trademark, especially if they are in different regions of the world or deal with distinct goods or services. This is because there is a small possibility of customer misunderstanding in such instances.

THE INTERCONNECTION BETWEEN TRADEMARKS AND DOMAIN NAMES:

In today's online business environment, having a visible online presence is critical. This is where domain names come in; they assist businesses in establishing their online brand. Choosing the correct domain name is critical, and one critical component is putting the company's trademark into it. A trademark is a well-known sign that represents a company in the real world, and having it in the domain name makes it easier for consumers to identify the company on the internet[14]. In disputes, the relationship between trademarks and domain names becomes obvious. If a domain name is associated with a trademark, possessing trademark rights is important for a successful settlement. Domain name disputes frequently arise when a domain name infringes on a trademark. This is why trademark owners must take precautions to protect their trademarks online[15].

While trademarks and domain names serve the same purposes, they are not similar. There are four major distinctions. To begin, trademark registration is limited to a single country, but

- No person shall be entitled to institute any proceeding to prevent, or to recover damages for the infringement of an unregistered trademark.
- Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to affect rights of action against any person for passing off goods or services as the goods of another person or as services provided by another person, or the remedies in respect thereof

[13] Thomas C. Folsom, „Space Pirates, Hitchhikers, Guides, and the Public Interest: Transformational Trademark Law in Cyberspace", Rutgers Law Review, Summer 2008.
[14] Rodney D. Ryder, Guide to Cyber Laws, Third edition, (New Delhi: Wadhwa and Company, 2007) p. 241.
[15] Mladen Vukmir, „Intellectual property Rights", in H. Vanhees (ed.), International Encyclopaedia of Laws - Intellectual Property, Vol. 2, (New Delhi: Wolters Kluwer (India) Pvt. Ltd, 2006) pp. 1 - 402 at p. 291.

domain name registration is global. Second, trademarks are registered to protect them in commerce, whereas domain names are registered to be used on the Internet[16]. Third, trademarks are associated with certain types of goods or services, but domain names are not. Finally, whereas the same trademark can be registered by various persons in different countries or for different purposes, there can only be one registrant for the same domain name because it operates globally[17].

NAVIGATING CONFLICTS: TRADEMARKS Vs. DOMAIN NAMES

Entrepreneurs in today's digital environment seek to safeguard their company identities online by registering them as domain names. This involves a large financial and time investment. Unfortunately, the large sums of money involved have allowed some parties to take advantage, resulting in domain name registration disputes. The rise in conflicts puts organizations like ICANN and the nation's legal systems under pressure[18]. The most prevalent sort of dispute involves competing rights between the owner of a domain name and the owner of a trademark. There are several major reasons for this dispute.

- The role of domain names has evolved from just providing addresses on the internet to becoming integral to online commercial activities. This shift sometimes creates conflicts with trademarks[19].
- Trademarks and domain names exist in separate worlds—the physical world for trademarks and the virtual world for domain names. Trademarks can have many holders in various locations, while domain names work on a worldwide scale, with only one holder for each unique domain name[20]. This variation in operation levels frequently leads to disputes.
- The lack of integration between the systems for registering trademarks and domain names is a major cause of dispute. Trademarks are registered on a national level, whereas

[16] Michael Blakeney and Fiona Macmillan, „Regulating Speech on the Internet", Digital Technology Law Journal, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1999,
[17] Graham J. H. Smith, Internet Law and Regulation, Fourth edition, (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 2007) p. 160.
[18] Ian Jay Kaufman, „The Domain Name System - Dispute Resolution and the Nice Classification System", International Business Lawyer, Vol. 28, January 2000, pp. 35 - 41 at p. 35.
[19] Satyam Infoway Ltd v. Sifynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd (2004) 6 SCC 145.
[20] Roger LeRoy Miller and Gaylord A. Jentz, Management & E-Commerce - The Online Legal Environment, (Australia: West Thomson Learning, 2002) p. 62.

domain names are registered on an international level[21]. Because of this lack of cooperation, there is no requirement to look for trademark issues when registering a domain name. This loophole enables someone to register a trademark as a domain name without being subject to various limitations[22].

- At last, in domain name registration, the "first-come-first-served" principle is a major source of conflict. According to this theory, the first person to register a domain name receives it. This puts pressure on trademark proprietors to register their trademarks as domain names as soon as possible to keep them from being taken over by someone else[23]. However, due to the competitive rush for registration, this procedure may disadvantage both trademark owners and internet users, who may wind up on undesired websites.

There are four main problems with the domain names and trademarks, these are:

- SAME NAMES:

Conflicts between trademarks and domain names are common since both are distinctive. Trademarks might be owned by individuals or corporations in the same or other nations, and they all desire to promote their businesses online by registering their trademarks as domain names. Domain names, on the other hand, are one-of-a-kind and can only be owned by one individual. The first person to register a trademark as a domain name receives the benefit, putting others who own the same property in a difficult position. Because all parties have a legal basis for their claims, this leads to disagreements. These cases are difficult to address under national legislation and international dispute resolution processes.

A dispute arose between Prince PLC (a British computer business) and Prince Sports Group Inc. (a United States tennis racket maker) over the domain name "prince.com." Although Prince PLC owned the domain, Prince Sports Group had the trademark "prince" in both the United States and the United Kingdom. Prince Sports Group sued Prince PLC for domain infringement and wanted the domain to be transferred.

[21] See Lockheed Martin Corp v. Network Solutions Inc. 985 F. Supp. 949 C.D. Cal., 1997.
[22] Brian Young, „World Wrestling Federation Entertainment Inc v. Michael Bosman: ICANN‟s Dispute Resolution Policy at Work‟, North Carolina Journal of Law & Technology, Vol. 1, 2002, pp. 65 - 100 at p. 74.
[23] Faye Fangfei Wang, „Domain Names Management and Dispute Resolutions: A Comparative Legal Study in the UK, US and China‟, Icfai Journal of Cyber Law, Vol. VII, No. 3, August 2008, pp. 8 - 24 at p. 11.

Instead of obeying Network Solutions Inc.'s (NSI) instructions, Prince PLC filed a lawsuit in the United Kingdom seeking relief[24]. This caused trouble with both UK and US courts getting involved. The UK court ruled that Prince Sports Group's threats were unlawful and issued an injunction, although it was uncertain about damages. The United States court, unsure of how to proceed, ordered Prince Sports Group to drop its suit. Despite the legal ambiguity, Prince PLC continues to use prince.com[25].

The case shows the difficulties associated with identical trademarks in the digital era. Existing laws struggle to resolve such conflicts due to fast technology advancements. Hence there is a need for alternative mechanisms to resolve such conflicts.

❖ CYBERSQUATTING:

Cybersquatting occurs when someone registers a domain name that they believe a business would desire to sell later for a profit. These individuals do not own any trademarks or business names, but they continue to get such website names. Cybersquatters are those who do this. They register website domains based on trademarks or business names. Cybersquatters may utilize domains that are similar to well-known companies to deceive customers or sell the website names back to legitimate owners for a large sum of money. To acquire the domain name, they desire from these cybersquatters, large corporations and trademark owners sometimes have to pay a considerable fee. This is because they can't use two website names that sound the same. To stop cybersquatters, companies sometimes have to go to court and fight against these unfair and illegal practices.

- Yahoo Inc. V. Aakash Arora & Anr[26].

  Before this case, Indian courts had not dealt with cybersquatting matters. In this case, a large corporation (MNC) held the trademark 'Yahoo!' and the website 'Yahoo.com.' The defendants owned an identical site called 'Yahooindia.com' and offered similar services. The MNC filed a lawsuit against Aakash Arora and others, requesting that the court permanently prohibit them from using a domain name that they felt was too similar. The court agreed with the MNC and told the defendants they couldn't

[24] In the field of information technology, it is said that the equation of the virtual world with the physical world is three months = one years. Anuradha Nayak and Manish Lakhawat, „Cybersquatting and Trademark Infringement", Icfai University Journal of Cyber Law, Vol. VII, No. 3, August 2008, pp. 54 - 60 at p. 59.
[25] Sally Tate, „The Domain Name Iceberg and Avoidable Collisions" Computers and Law Vol. 8, No. 5, 1997. Available at.
[26] 1999 PTC (19) 201 Delhi.

use 'Yahoo' as a trademark or domain name on the internet. The court also said they couldn't use the same code as 'Yahoo.' The reason was that the defendants were trying to benefit from the MNC's well-known trademark. The court emphasized that just because someone registers a domain name doesn't mean they have the right to use it however they want, especially if it infringes on someone else's trademark.

❖ DOMAIN NAME REGISTRATION: SIMILAR TO FAMOUS TRADEMARKS:

People may abuse domain name registration by generating a website address that appears to be extremely close to a well-known trademark or an existing domain name. Customers might be misled if they believe both sites advocate the same items or services[27]. Those who register these identical domain names depend on users making simple typing errors when putting in prominent website names. They register several variants of the name with frequent typos to confuse people and profit from the reputation of the well-known name[28].

These new domain names are only slightly different from the well-known ones, making it difficult for buyers to distinguish between them. This might include spelling the name incorrectly or adding a letter or word[29]. People may land up on these somewhat different sites if they make a typo when typing a well-known name, and they may be duped by these deceptive behaviors[30]. This form of deception is known as typosquatting or cyber piracy, and the people who engage in it are known as typosquatters or cyber parasites[31].

❖ UNFAIR TACTICS: TRYING TO STEAL DOMAINS {Reverse domain name hijacking}

Reverse domain name hijacking is a relatively new problem in website registration. It occurs when someone, often a big business with a trademark, attempts to unfairly acquire possession of a domain name from someone who has done nothing wrong and has a legitimate cause for

[27] Jayashree Watal, Intellectual Property Rights in the WTO and Developing Countries, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001) p. 262

[28] Xuan-Thao N. Nguyen, „Blame it on the cybersquatters: How Congress Partially Ends the Circus Among the Circuits with the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act", Loyola University Chicago Law Journal, Vol. 32, 2000 - 2001, pp. 777 - 813 at p. 792

[29] Microsoft Corporation v. Microsof.com, WIPO Case No. D2000-0548 (21 July 2000).

[30] Robert A. Badgley, „Internet Domain Names and ICANN Arbitration: The Emerging "Law" of Domain Name Custody Disputes, Texas Review of Law and Politics, Vol. 5, 2000 - 2001, pp. 343 - 392 at p. 346.
Roger E. Schechter and John R. Thomas, Intellectual Property – The Law of Copyrights, Patents & Trademarks, (MN: West Group, 2003) p. 792.

[31] Roger E. Schechter and John R. Thomas, Intellectual Property – The Law of Copyrights, Patents & Trademarks, (MN: West Group, 2003) p. 792.

possessing it. The individual attempting to take over the domain is aware that the present owner has a legitimate purpose for owning it, but goes to court with evil motives, frequently only to annoy the owner. In these cases, it is the legitimate domain owner who is in difficulty, not the trademark owners.

Reverse domain name hijacking has grown more widespread as a result of cybersquatting disputes. To safeguard their rights, trademark owners originally sued others who registered identical names, and they frequently succeeded. However, over time, trademark owners began to threaten innocent domain owners with legal action to force them to give up their names[32].

However, the law doesn't handle this situation well. This lack of a clear solution means more cases of reverse domain name hijacking are happening, and trademark owners are using the threat of long and expensive legal battles to make rightful domain owners give up. This puts individuals and small businesses in a tough spot because they don't have the resources to fight lengthy legal battles over domain names and trademarks.

RESOLVING DOMAIN DISPUTES: UDRP AND ADR MECHANISMS

Dealing with domain name and trademark disputes on a worldwide scale is difficult due to the internet's global nature. The Uniform Domain-Name Dispute-Resolution Policy (UDRP)[33] was designed to address this issue, and while it has resolved many conflicts, more work has to be done to improve its effectiveness. Several domain registries have created dispute resolution procedures comparable to the UDRP, however, they are not without defects. The growing number of these forums may be a problem in the future. Furthermore, the increased dependence on these new mechanisms has resulted in a disregard for established Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) processes that may efficiently resolve many domain name conflicts.

[32] Paragraph 1 of the UDRP Rules - Reverse Domain Name Hijacking means using the Policy in bad faith to attempt to deprive a registered domain-name holder of a domain name.
Anne Gilson LaLonde, „Litigation Alternatives: UDRP and Trademark Office Proceedings", Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks, and Literary Property Course Handbook Series, June-July, 2007.

[33] After the UDRP has been formulated, less than one percent of all the domain name disputes have continued in the courts. Stephen Kinsey, „Implications of Trading on the Web", in Adam Jolly and Jeremy Philpott (eds.), A Handbook of Intellectual Property Management - Protecting, Developing and Exploiting Your IP Assets, (London: Kogan Pages, 2004) pp. 86 - 90 at p. 89.

While the UDRP and registrar dispute mechanisms handle bad faith registrations well, they do not cover all domain name issues. Issues with similar trademarks may need non-adversarial ADR techniques such as negotiation, mediation, and conciliation.

It is critical to acknowledge the significance of both UDRP and usual ADR processes. Internal UDRP changes are required, such as addressing evidential review, establishing ill faith, and eliminating prejudice. Simultaneously, traditional ADR techniques require marketing and trust-building to encourage their usage for peaceful resolutions, particularly in situations of good faith domain registrations.

SETTLING DISPUTES BETWEEN DOMAIN NAMES AND TRADEMARKS IN INDIA:

In India, dealing with domain name and trademark conflicts has gone through three stages: using the courts, using the UDRP, and founding the INDRP. Initially, courts interpreted provisions on trademark infringement and passing off under the Trade Marks Act of 1999. This strategy, however, has limitations because there is no particular law for protecting domain names, and the Trade Mark Act has geographical restrictions.

As a result of these difficulties, more Indian cases are now being heard by UDRP panels. However, the UDRP has limits, leading to the investigation of an alternative known as the INDRP. However, the INDRP, which was influenced by the UDRP, was first met with suspicion by Indian litigants who are more accustomed to traditional court settlements.

INDRP has its obstacles, such as complainants' requirement to show many elements and difficulties in combining complaints. Arbitrators are attempting to address these issues by favoring trademark owners, but there is concern that the INDRP will be used to force genuine domain name owners. The fundamental concern is to avoid a shift in the desire to defend trademarks from historical mistreatment of trademark owners to future victimization of domain name owners.

CONCLUSION

Using procedures like arbitration and mediation to resolve domain name disputes is a good idea. These techniques are quicker, less expensive, and more equitable than going to court. They may be adjusted to each scenario, making it easier to figure out solutions that are acceptable to all parties. This is preferable to lengthy judicial fights. As the internet evolves, it's evident that employing these approaches for domain name disputes is critical. Regular litigation, which is slow and rigorous, does not necessarily work effectively for these challenges. Arbitration and mediation are speedier and more adaptable to the individual difficulties that arise. These strategies encourage communication and establish common ground, making it simpler to defend trademarks and cooperate to solve problems.

Based on the findings, it is a good idea for businesses and domain name owners to look into arbitration and mediation. Being proactive and employing these strategies may lead to speedier solutions, maintaining good relationships, and the efficient use of resources.

Simply put, this study proposes a new approach to dealing with domain name and trademark issues. Using arbitration and mediation helps individuals deal with the issues of the Internet more successfully. Instead of viewing disagreements as obstacles, they could be viewed as opportunities to discover constructive solutions and progress. As we go further into the digital era, adopting arbitration and mediation for domain name disputes is a logical and forward-thinking strategy to safeguard ideas and make the internet a better place.

REFERENCES

- ✓ Black, Sharon K., Telecommunications Law in the Internet Age, San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann, 2002.
- ✓ Capper, Phillip, International Arbitration: A Handbook, Third edition, London: Lovells, 2004.
- ✓ Chissick, Michael and Kelman, Alistair, Electronic Commerce: Law and Practice, London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1999.
- ✓ Colston, Catherine and Middleton, Kirsty, Modern Intellectual Property Law, second edition, London: Cavendish Publishing Ltd, 2005.
- ✓ Badgley, Robert A., Domain Name Disputes, New York: Aspen Publishers, 2003.
- ✓ Davidson, Alan, The Law of Electronic Commerce, Australia: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- ✓ Epstein, Michael A., Epstein on Intellectual Property, Fifth edition, New Delhi: Wolters Kluwer (India) Pvt. Ltd., 2008.
- ✓ Ferrera, Gerald R., et al., Cyber Law - Text and Cases, Second edition, Ohio: West Legal Studies in Business, 2004.
- ✓ Goldberg, Stephen, et al, Dispute Resolution: Negotiation, Mediation, and Other Process, Second edition, London: Little, Brown and Company, 1992.
- ✓ Hart, Tina and Fazzani, Linda, Intellectual Property Law, Second edition, New York: Palgrave, 2000. • Hedley, Steve, The Law of Electronic Commerce and the Internet in the UK and Ireland, London: Cavendish Publishing Ltd., 2006
- ✓ Abel, Sally M., „The United States of America" in Bettinger, Torsten (ed.), Domain Name Law and Practice – An International Handbook, New York: Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 889 - 925.
- ✓ Bartow, Ann, „Exporting Trademark Confusion", in Spinello, Richard A. and Tavani, Herman T. (eds.), Intellectual Property Rights in a Networked World: Theory and Practice, London: Information Science Publishing, 2005, pp. 113 - 160.
- ✓ Chakravarti, A. K. and Tripathi, R. C., „Exploring Possibilities in enabled Legal Profession in IPR", in Agarwala, Kamlesh N., and Tiwari, Murli D. (ed.s), IT and Indian Legal System, New Delhi: Mac Millan, 2002 pp. 147 - 159.
- ✓ Chia, Ken, „E-World", in York, Stephen and Chia, Ken (eds.), ECommerce – A Guide to the Law of Electronic Business, London: Butterworths, 1999, pp. 1 - 10.
- ✓ Christie, Andrew, „The ICANN Domain Name Dispute Resolution System as a Model for Resolving Other Intellectual Property Disputes on the Internet", in Vaver, David (ed.), Intellectual Property Rights - Critical Concepts in Law, Vol. V, London: Routledge, 2006, pp. 180 - 193.
- ✓ Dayal, Anish, „Law and Liability on the Internet" in Agarwala, Kamlesh N. and Tiwari, Murali D. (eds.), IT and Indian Legal System, New Delhi: MacMillan, 2002, pp. 52 - 71.

- ✓ Dinwoodie, Graeme B., „(National) Trademark Laws and the (Non-National) Domain Name System", Vaver, David (ed.), Intellectual Property Rights - Critical Concepts in Law, Vol. IV, London: Routledge, 2006, pp. 143 - 165.
- ✓ Halpern, Sheldon W., Craig Allen Nard and Kenneth Port, „Scope of Exclusive Rights", in Vanhees, H. (ed.), International Encyclopedia of Laws - Intellectual Property, Vol. 5, New Delhi: Wolters Kluwer (India) Pvt. Ltd., 2000, pp. 382 - 393.
- ✓ Kinsey, Stephen, „Implications of Trading on the Web", in Jolly, Adam, and Philpott, Jeremy (eds.), A Handbook of Intellectual Property Management - Protecting, Developing and Exploiting Your IP Assets, London: Kogan Pages, 2004, pp. 86 - 90.
- ✓ Majmudar, Ankit and Kamath, Nandan, „Name-Calling in Cyberspace" Domain Names and the Law", in Kamath, Nandan (ed.), Law Relating to Computers, Internet and E-Commerce, Second edition, New Delhi: Universal Law Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., 2005, pp. 210 - 249.
- ✓ Sugden, Paul, „Trademarks and Domain Names", in Forder, Jay, and Quirk, Patrick (eds.), Electronic Commerce and the Law, Australia: John Wiley & Sons, 2001, pp. 198 - 226.
- ✓ Vukmir, Mladen, „Intellectual property Rights", in Vanhees, H. (ed.), International Encyclopedia of Laws - Intellectual Property, Vol. 2, New Delhi: Wolters Kluwer (India) Pvt. Ltd, 2006, pp. 1 - 402.
- ✓ Bloomberg Finance L.P. v. Kanhan Vijay INDRP/110 (08 September 2009)
- ✓ Bostitch v. McGarry (1964) R.P.C. 173
- ✓ British Telecommunications Plc and Another v. One in a Million Ltd. and Others [1998] 4 All E.R. 476
- ✓ Broadbridge Media, L.L.C. v. Hypercd.com 106 F. Supp. 2d 505, 508-09 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) • Can I Do Better Internet Corp. v. Blast applications, WIPO Case No. Case No. D2011-0055 (08 March 2011)
- ✓ Car Toys Inc. v. Informa Unlimited Inc. National Arbitration Forum File No. FA0002000093682 (20 March 2000)
- ✓ Casio India Co. Limited v. Ashita Tele Systems Pvt. Limited 106 (2003) DLT 554
- ✓ Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd. WIPO Case No. D2003-0455 (21 August 2003)
- ✓ De Agostini S.p.A. v. Marco Cialone, WIPO Case No. DTV2002-0005 (09 September 2002)