

Cyber Space and Trademark Infringement: Issues of Domain Names and Passing Off

Neeraj Bansal¹, Shivina Rathore²

¹Student, Law Department, Jagannath University, Jaipur, India


²Faculty of Law, Law Department, Jagannath University, Jaipur, India

Corresponding Author Email: neeraj16bansa@gmail.com



<https://doi.org/10.55041/ijstmt.v2i5.241>

Cite this Article: Bansal, N. (2026). Cyber Space and Trademark Infringement: Issues of Domain Names and Passing Off. International Journal of Science, Strategic Management and Technology, 02(05). <https://doi.org/10.55041/ijstmt.v2i5.241>

License:  This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are properly credited.

Abstract-

The rapid expansion of digital commerce has transformed trademarks from traditional market identifiers into valuable online assets, making their protection in cyberspace increasingly significant. Domain names, originally created as technical internet addresses, now function as commercial identifiers closely associated with business identity, goodwill, and consumer trust. This evolution has given rise to new forms of trademark misuse, particularly cybersquatting, deceptive domain registrations, and online passing off. The borderless and anonymous nature of the internet creates complex legal challenges relating to jurisdiction, enforcement, identification of infringers, and the application of territorial trademark laws. This paper critically examines the legal issues surrounding trademark infringement in cyberspace, with particular focus on domain name disputes and the doctrine of passing off. It analyzes the conceptual relationship between trademarks and domain names, explores judicial developments in India and comparative international approaches, and evaluates dispute resolution mechanisms such as the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and national remedies under trademark law. The study further identifies emerging enforcement challenges, including intermediary liability, trans-border reputation, and evolving digital modes of infringement. It concludes that while judicial innovation and regulatory mechanisms have strengthened trademark protection in the digital

environment, effective enforcement requires harmonized international standards, stronger intermediary accountability, and adaptive legal interpretation to safeguard trademark rights in the evolving digital economy.

Keywords - Cyberspace; Domain Names; Trademark Infringement; Passing Off; Cybersquatting

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of cyberspace has significantly altered the structure of modern commerce, communication, and brand engagement. Businesses today operate in a predominantly digital environment where trademarks no longer function merely as physical labels affixed to goods, but as virtual signifiers embedded within websites, domain names, search engines, and online marketplaces. The internet has thus transformed trademarks into digital assets that perform not only a source-identification function but also a reputational and economic role in a globally accessible market.

With the increasing reliance on the internet for commercial transactions, the protection of trademarks has assumed heightened importance. Domain names, though originally designed as technical tools to locate resources on the internet, now operate as powerful commercial identifiers. In practice, consumers often

equate a domain name with the business itself, particularly where the domain incorporates a well-known trademark. This functional convergence has generated legal disputes concerning unauthorized registration and use of trademark-identical or deceptively similar domain names, commonly manifested through practices such as cybersquatting and online passing off.

Trademark infringement in cyberspace presents challenges that differ substantially from traditional infringement in physical markets. The borderless nature of the internet complicates questions of territorial jurisdiction, applicable law, and enforcement mechanisms. Additionally, the ease and anonymity of domain name registration have enabled bad-faith actors to exploit established trademarks without engaging in direct sale of infringing goods. Online infringement frequently operates through mechanisms such as initial interest confusion, misleading domain names, and diversion of web traffic, causing dilution of goodwill even in the absence of tangible consumer transactions.

The doctrine of passing off, rooted in common law principles of goodwill and misrepresentation, has gained renewed relevance in addressing online trademark disputes. Courts have increasingly acknowledged that goodwill can subsist in a digital presence and that misrepresentation through domain names or websites can result in actionable deception.¹ Alongside judicial developments, international regulatory frameworks such as the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) have emerged to address cross-border disputes, reflecting an evolving interaction between trademark law and internet governance.²

In this context, the present study undertakes a detailed examination of trademark infringement in cyberspace, with particular emphasis on domain name disputes and the doctrine of passing off. The study seeks to analyze existing legal frameworks, judicial responses, and regulatory mechanisms, while identifying emerging challenges and evaluating the adequacy of current

protections in safeguarding trademark rights in the digital age.

II. TRADEMARKS AND CYBERSPACE: CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

2.1 Meaning and Scope of Trademarks

A trademark is a legally protected sign capable of distinguishing the goods or services of one undertaking from those of others. It may consist of words, names, symbols, logos, numerals, or combinations thereof, provided it is capable of graphical representation and source identification. The primary purpose of trademark law is to prevent consumer confusion and protect the goodwill that a trader acquires through consistent commercial use.

In the digital context, trademarks retain their essential legal characteristics but operate within an expanded commercial space where brand identity is increasingly represented through online platforms. Websites, search engine listings, and online marketplaces have become primary arenas for trademark use, thereby extending the functional reach of trademarks beyond traditional physical markets. This expansion increases both the commercial value of trademarks and their vulnerability to misuse.³

2.2 Meaning and Nature of Cyberspace

Cyberspace refers to the virtual environment created by interconnected computer networks, including the internet, digital communication systems, and online platforms. It is characterized by instantaneous global access, decentralization, and the absence of territorial boundaries. From a legal perspective, cyberspace presents challenges to conventional regulatory frameworks due to its transnational nature and the difficulty of attributing conduct to identifiable jurisdictions.⁴

Commercial activity in cyberspace is largely driven by digital identifiers that enable users to locate and interact with businesses. Among these identifiers, domain names

¹ Gov't of Mizoram, Trademark Law in Cyberspace 12–14, <https://dict.mizoram.gov.in/uploads/attachments/cc106a42eac8b887565f0409393f9c25/trademark-law-cyberspace.pdf>

² Cyber Space and Trademark Infringement: Issues of Domain Names and Passing Off, MANUPATRA NEWSLINE (2023), <https://docs.manupatra.in/newslines/articles/Upload/3C8A0D6B-C3E0-4671-A3D2-FF0958230DE9.pdf>

³ Fenwick & West LLP, Trademark Protection in Cyberspace 1–3(2000), https://assets.fenwick.com/legacy/FenwickDocuments/Trademark_in_Cyberspace.pdf.

⁴ BAOU, Copyright and Trademark in Cyberspace 6–8, https://baou.edu.in/assets/pdf/PGDCL_202_slm.pdf.

occupy a central position as gateways to online commercial presence, making them legally significant in the context of trademark protection.

2.3 Domain Names: Definition and Legal Significance

A domain name is an alphanumeric string registered under the Domain Name System (DNS) that functions as an internet address directing users to a specific website. While technically administrative in nature, domain names have evolved into commercially valuable assets that often mirror or incorporate trademarks. Consumers frequently associate domain names with the source, authenticity, and credibility of goods or services offered online.⁵

Unlike trademarks, which are granted following statutory examination and registration, domain names are allocated on a first-come-first-served basis without substantive scrutiny. This structural distinction facilitates bad-faith registrations where individuals register domain names identical or deceptively similar to well-known trademarks with the intention of exploiting their goodwill.⁶

2.4 Trademark Infringement and Passing Off in Cyberspace

Trademark infringement occurs when an unauthorized party uses a mark identical or deceptively similar to a registered trademark in a manner likely to cause confusion among consumers. In cyberspace, infringement often manifests through misleading domain names, imitation websites, and unauthorized use of trademarks in online content. The digital environment amplifies the likelihood of confusion, as consumers frequently rely on minimal information such as domain names or search results to form initial impressions.

Passing off, a common law remedy, protects unregistered trademark rights by preventing misrepresentation that damages or is likely to damage goodwill. In cyberspace, courts have recognized that

goodwill may subsist in online reputation alone and that misrepresentation through digital means can satisfy the traditional elements of passing off. This makes passing off particularly relevant where statutory trademark remedies are limited by territorial or registration constraints.⁷

2.5 Initial Interest Confusion in the Online Environment

Initial interest confusion refers to a situation where a consumer's attention is attracted through unauthorized use of a trademark, even if confusion is dispelled before a transaction occurs. In cyberspace, this doctrine assumes heightened relevance because domain names and hyperlinks often serve as the first point of consumer engagement. Unauthorized diversion of internet traffic through misleading domain names allows infringers to benefit from the trademark owner's goodwill, thereby constituting actionable harm.⁸

The recognition of initial interest confusion reflects the judiciary's attempt to adapt trademark principles to the realities of online commerce, where competitive advantage can be gained long before a purchase decision is made.

III. DOMAIN NAMES AND TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

3.1 Concept of Domain Names and Their Commercial Misuse

Domain names function as unique identifiers within the Domain Name System (DNS), enabling users to locate websites on the internet. While technically administrative, domain names have acquired substantial commercial value due to their role in brand visibility and consumer trust. In many cases, a domain name incorporating a trademark becomes synonymous with the business itself, making unauthorized use legally significant.

⁵ Aditi Sahay & Gauri Kanodia, Analyzing the Implication of Trademark and Copyright in Cyberspace (2025), <https://www.cnlu.ac.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Analyzing-The-Implication-Of-Trademark-And-Copyright-In-Cyberspace-by-Aditi-Sahay-Gauri-Kanodia.pdf>.

⁶ Cybersquatting and Trademark Infringement, 5 INT'L J.L. MGMT. & HUMAN. 1123, 1125–26 (2022).

⁷ Manupatra Newline, Cyber Space and Trademark Infringement: Issues of Domain Names and Passing Off (2023), <https://docs.manupatra.in/newline/articles/Upload/732b8573-24a1-4cb3-b98d-60a6fa364c0a.pdf>.

⁸ Supra Note 6.

Trademark infringement through domain names typically arises when a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a registered trademark and is used in a manner likely to deceive or divert consumers. Such misuse exploits the goodwill associated with established marks and undermines the source-identifying function of trademarks in cyberspace.

3.2 Cybersquatting: Meaning and Elements

Cybersquatting refers to the practice of registering, trafficking in, or using a domain name identical or deceptively similar to a trademark with bad-faith intent to profit from the goodwill of the mark. The essential elements of cybersquatting include:

1. Registration of a domain name identical or confusingly similar to a trademark;
2. Absence of legitimate rights or interests in the domain name; and
3. Bad-faith intent, such as resale to the trademark owner or diversion of web traffic.

Cybersquatting represents one of the most prevalent forms of online trademark infringement due to the ease of domain name registration and the absence of substantive scrutiny at the allocation stage.

3.3 Initial Interest Confusion and Online Infringement

Unlike traditional infringement, online trademark disputes often involve *initial interest confusion*, where consumers are momentarily misled by a domain name before realizing that the website is not associated with the trademark owner. Even where confusion is dispelled prior to a transaction, the infringer gains unfair competitive advantage by attracting internet traffic through deceptive means. Courts and commentators increasingly recognize that such diversion constitutes actionable trademark harm in cyberspace.

3.4 Passing Off Through Domain Names

Passing off occurs where a defendant misrepresents its goods or services as being associated with the plaintiff, thereby causing damage to the plaintiff's goodwill. In cyberspace, passing off frequently arises through deceptive domain names, imitation websites, or

misleading online representations. Courts have accepted that goodwill can subsist in an online reputation alone and that physical presence within a jurisdiction is not a prerequisite for maintaining an action in passing off.

3.5 Regulatory Mechanism: Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP)

The Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), administered by ICANN, provides a streamlined, non-judicial mechanism for resolving domain name disputes. To succeed under the UDRP, a complainant must establish that:

1. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark;
2. The registrant has no legitimate rights or interests in the domain name; and
3. The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.⁹

The UDRP has played a significant role in harmonizing global responses to cybersquatting, though it remains limited to cancellation or transfer of domain names and does not award damages.

3.6 Comparative Overview: Trademark Infringement vs. Passing Off in Domain Name Disputes

Basis	Trademark Infringement	Passing Off
Nature	Statutory remedy	Common law remedy
Requirement	Registered trademark	Proof of goodwill
Territoriality	Jurisdiction-specific	Flexible, reputation-based
Relevance in cyberspace	Strong for registered marks	Crucial where registration is absent

This distinction highlights the complementary role played by infringement and passing off in addressing domain name disputes in cyberspace.

⁹ 19. ICANN, Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy4(a), <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/help/dndr/udrp-en>.

3.7 Emerging Challenges in Domain Name Enforcement

Despite judicial and regulatory developments, enforcement of trademark rights against domain name misuse continues to face challenges such as jurisdictional conflicts, anonymity of registrants, and inconsistent global standards. These challenges underscore the need for adaptive legal frameworks capable of responding to the evolving nature of online infringement.¹⁰

IV. JUDICIAL APPROACH TO DOMAIN NAME DISPUTES IN CYBERSPACE

4.1 Judicial Recognition of Domain Names as Business Identifiers

Courts across jurisdictions have consistently acknowledged that domain names are not merely technical internet addresses but serve a commercial function analogous to trademarks. Judicial recognition of this reality has been central to extending trademark protection to cyberspace. Courts have emphasized that because consumers often associate a domain name directly with the source of goods or services, misuse of trademarked domain names is capable of causing deception and confusion.

This judicial approach reflects a purposive interpretation of trademark law, adapting traditional principles to the technological realities of online commerce.

4.2 Indian Judicial Approach to Domain Name Infringement

Indian courts have played a significant role in shaping jurisprudence relating to domain name disputes. In *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd.*, the Supreme Court of India explicitly recognized that domain names possess all the characteristics of trademarks and are entitled to equal legal protection. The Court held that unauthorized registration of confusingly similar domain names could constitute both trademark infringement and passing off, even in the absence of physical market overlap.¹¹

The Court further clarified that goodwill can exist in the virtual space and that deception caused through online misrepresentation is actionable irrespective of territorial limitations. This decision laid the foundation for subsequent Indian jurisprudence on cyberspace trademark disputes.

In *Yahoo! Inc. v. Akash Arora*, the Delhi High Court restrained the defendant from using a deceptively similar domain name, emphasizing that internet users are likely to assume a connection between identical or similar domain names. The Court rejected the argument that disclaimers on websites were sufficient to avoid confusion, recognizing the unique vulnerabilities of online consumers.¹²

4.3 Passing Off and Trans-Border Reputation in Cyberspace

Indian courts have consistently upheld the doctrine of trans-border reputation in cyberspace-related disputes. In *Rediff Communication Ltd. v. Cyberbooth*, the Bombay High Court observed that the use of a deceptively similar domain name amounts to passing off when it misleads internet users into believing an association with the plaintiff. The Court stressed that the speed and reach of the internet magnify the likelihood of confusion and consequent damage.¹³

These decisions demonstrate judicial willingness to protect goodwill that exists primarily or exclusively in the digital domain, reinforcing the relevance of passing off in online trademark disputes.

4.4 International Judicial Trends

International courts have similarly recognized the trademark significance of domain names. In the United States, courts have applied trademark principles to domain name disputes, particularly in cases involving bad-faith registration and consumer confusion. European courts have also acknowledged that domain names can infringe trademark rights when they create a likelihood of confusion or unfairly exploit the reputation of well-known marks.

¹⁰ Copyright and Trademark in Cyberspace, BAOU 18–20, https://baou.edu.in/assets/pdf/PGDCL_202_slm.pdf.

¹¹ *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145 (India).

¹² *Yahoo! Inc. v. Akash Arora*, 1999 SCC OnLine Del 931 (India).

¹³ *Rediff Commc'n Ltd. v. Cyberbooth*, 1999 SCC OnLine Bom 684 (India).

These judicial trends reflect convergence in global legal reasoning, despite differences in statutory frameworks, emphasizing the universal recognition of trademarks in cyberspace.

4.5 Role of Judicial Interpretation in Shaping Cyber Trademark Law

Judicial intervention has been instrumental in bridging the gap between traditional trademark doctrines and emerging digital challenges. Courts have adapted established principles such as likelihood of confusion, goodwill, and misrepresentation to the virtual environment without diluting their conceptual foundations. Through purposive interpretation, the judiciary has ensured that trademark law remains responsive to evolving forms of online infringement.

However, judicial remedies remain reactive and case-specific, underscoring the need for complementary regulatory mechanisms and international cooperation to address the dynamic nature of cyberspace disputes.

V. LEGAL REMEDIES AND ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS AGAINST CYBER TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

The expansion of trademark misuse in cyberspace has necessitated the development of specialized legal remedies and enforcement mechanisms. Traditional trademark remedies, though applicable, are supplemented by domain-specific dispute resolution frameworks and technological enforcement tools to effectively address online infringement.

5.1 Civil Remedies under Trademark Law

Under the **Trade Marks Act, 1999**, trademark owners are entitled to civil remedies against unauthorized use of marks in cyberspace. Courts have consistently held that infringement and passing off occurring through websites, domain names, and online platforms fall within the ambit of statutory protection. The primary civil remedies include injunctions (interim and permanent), damages, accounts of profits, and delivery up of infringing material. Indian courts have shown readiness to grant **ex parte and interim injunctions** in

cyber trademark cases due to the speed and scale of online harm.¹⁴

Importantly, courts have recognized that delay in granting relief may irreparably damage brand reputation and consumer trust in digital markets.

5.2 Passing Off Actions in Online Context

Passing off remains a crucial remedy where trademark registration is absent or insufficient. In cyberspace, the misrepresentation element is often established through deceptive domain names, meta-tags, keyword advertising, and website layouts that create consumer confusion. Indian jurisprudence confirms that the classical trinity of goodwill, misrepresentation, and damage applies equally to online business environments.¹⁵

The anonymous and borderless nature of the internet, however, poses challenges in identifying infringers and enforcing judgments, necessitating swift judicial intervention.

5.3 Domain Name Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

To address cybersquatting efficiently, specialized dispute resolution systems have been introduced. The **Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP)** administered by ICANN allows trademark owners to seek cancellation or transfer of infringing domain names without resorting to prolonged litigation. Similarly, India follows the **.IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP)** for country-code domains.

These mechanisms require proof of (i) similarity with a trademark, (ii) absence of legitimate interest, and (iii) bad faith registration. UDRP and INDRP proceedings are cost-effective and time-efficient, though limited to domain-related remedies.

5.4 Criminal Liability and Technological Enforcement

In certain circumstances, cyber trademark infringement may attract criminal liability under trademark and information technology laws, particularly where fraud, impersonation, or counterfeiting is involved. Additionally, technological enforcement measures such as takedown notices, platform liability mechanisms, and

¹⁴ Trade Marks Act, No. 47 of 1999, §§ 27, 134 (India).

¹⁵ Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd., (2004) 6 SCC 145 (India).

intermediary compliance obligations have emerged as vital tools in combating online infringement.¹⁶

The growing role of intermediaries, including domain registrars and e-commerce platforms, underscores the need for cooperative enforcement frameworks balancing trademark protection and digital freedoms.

5.5 Limitations of Existing Enforcement Framework

Despite the availability of remedies, enforcement remains fragmented due to jurisdictional conflicts, anonymity of infringers, and inconsistent intermediary cooperation. The absence of a unified international legal framework for cyber trademark protection often results in uneven enforcement and forum shopping, highlighting the need for global harmonization.

VI. CHALLENGES AND EMERGING ISSUES IN CYBERSPACE TRADEMARK PROTECTION

Despite the availability of statutory remedies and dispute resolution mechanisms, trademark enforcement in cyberspace continues to face significant structural and legal challenges. The dynamic nature of the internet, combined with jurisdictional and technological complexities, has exposed limitations in traditional trademark law frameworks.

6.1 Jurisdictional and Cross-Border Enforcement Challenges

Cyberspace inherently transcends territorial boundaries, while trademark rights remain territorially confined. Online infringement often involves registrants, servers, and consumers located in different jurisdictions, complicating questions of jurisdiction and applicable law. Courts have struggled to balance territorial trademark principles with the global accessibility of websites, leading to inconsistent approaches in asserting jurisdiction.¹⁷

This lack of uniformity weakens effective enforcement and increases litigation costs for trademark owners.

6.2 Anonymity and Identification of Infringers

Cybersquatters and infringers frequently conceal their identities using privacy shields, proxy registrations, and offshore hosting services. Such anonymity delays legal action and frustrates enforcement efforts, particularly in passing off actions where identifying the source of misrepresentation is critical.¹⁸

While domain dispute mechanisms mitigate this issue to some extent, anonymity remains a persistent enforcement obstacle.

6.3 Intermediary Liability and Platform Accountability

The role of intermediaries—such as domain registrars, hosting providers, and online marketplaces—has emerged as a contentious issue. While intermediaries facilitate digital commerce, their passive or delayed response to infringement notices can exacerbate trademark violations. Legal regimes differ significantly in defining intermediary obligations, resulting in regulatory uncertainty.

Balancing trademark enforcement with freedom of expression and innovation continues to be a delicate legal challenge.

6.4 Evolving Forms of Online Trademark Misuse

Technological developments have expanded the modes of infringement beyond traditional domain name disputes. Practices such as keyword advertising misuse, social media impersonation, and misleading mobile applications pose novel challenges not fully addressed by existing legal doctrines.

VII. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The expansion of commercial activity into cyberspace has fundamentally altered the landscape of trademark protection. Traditional trademark principles—rooted in territoriality, physical markets, and tangible goods—have been significantly challenged by the borderless, anonymous, and rapidly evolving nature of the internet. Issues such as domain name disputes, cybersquatting, and online passing off demonstrate that trademark

¹⁶ Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd., (2004) 6 SCC 145 (India).

¹⁷ World Intellectual Prop. Org., Intellectual Property on the Internet 88–90 (2019).

¹⁸ Int'l J. Legal Stud. & Res., Cybersquatting and Trademark Infringement 6–8 (2021).

infringement in cyberspace is not merely a technological concern but a complex legal and policy challenge.

Judicial responses, both in India and internationally, reflect a growing recognition that trademark law must adapt to digital realities. Courts have increasingly applied conventional doctrines of passing off, likelihood of confusion, and bad faith to online contexts, while also acknowledging the evidentiary and jurisdictional difficulties posed by cyberspace. Mechanisms such as the UDRP have provided efficient alternatives to litigation, yet they remain limited in scope and remedial reach.¹⁹

Despite these developments, enforcement gaps persist. Jurisdictional conflicts, anonymity of infringers, inconsistent intermediary liability standards, and emerging forms of online misuse continue to undermine effective trademark protection. Existing legal frameworks often lag behind technological innovation, resulting in reactive rather than preventive enforcement.

Suggestions and Way Forward

- 1. Harmonisation of International Standards:** Greater convergence between domestic trademark laws and international domain name dispute mechanisms is essential to address cross-border infringement effectively.²⁰
- 2. Strengthening Intermediary Accountability:** Clearer statutory obligations for domain registrars, hosting providers, and digital platforms can enhance timely takedown and preventive enforcement while safeguarding legitimate speech.
- 3. Judicial Capacity Building:** Specialized IP benches and technical training for adjudicators can improve consistency and efficiency in resolving cyber trademark disputes.
- 4. Dynamic Interpretation of Trademark Law:** Courts must continue adopting purposive and technology-neutral interpretations to address evolving digital business models and deceptive online practices.

In conclusion, while trademark law has shown resilience in responding to cyberspace challenges, sustained reform, international cooperation, and adaptive

jurisprudence are crucial to ensure effective protection of trademark rights in the digital era.

VIII. REFERENCES

I. Statutes and International Instruments

1. Trade Marks Act, No. 47 of 1999 (India).
2. Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000 (India).
3. Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), ICANN (1999).
4. Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, ICANN.
5. Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, Mar. 20, 1883.
6. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), Apr. 15, 1994.

II. Judicial Decisions (Case Laws)

1. *Yahoo! Inc. v. Akash Arora*, 1999 (19) PTC 201 (Del).
2. *Rediff Communication Ltd. v. Cyberbooth*, 2000 (21) PTC 209 (Bom).
3. *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions Pvt. Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145.
4. *Tata Sons Ltd. v. Manu Kosuri*, 2001 PTC 432 (Del).
5. *People Interactive (I) Pvt. Ltd. v. Vivek Pahwa*, 2016 SCC OnLine Bom 7350.
6. *Brookfield Commc'ns, Inc. v. West Coast Ent. Corp.*, 174 F.3d 1036 (9th Cir. 1999).

III. Books and Academic Commentaries

1. Bently, Lionel et al., *Intellectual Property Law* (5th ed. 2018).
2. Cornish, William & Llewelyn, David, *Intellectual Property: Patents, Copyright, Trade Marks and Allied Rights* (8th ed. 2013).
3. Narayanan, P., *Law of Trade Marks and Passing Off* (7th ed. 2017).
4. WIPO, *Intellectual Property and the Internet* (2019).

IV. Research Articles and Journals

1. Cybersquatting and Trademark Infringement, 8 *Int'l J. L. & Mgmt. Hum.* 1 (2021).
2. Trademark and Copyright in Cyberspace, *Int'l J. Sci. & Eng'g Res.* (2020).

¹⁹ World Intellectual Prop. Org., WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ¶¶ 1.1–1.3 (3d ed. 2017).

²⁰ World Intellectual Prop. Org., *Intellectual Property and the Internet* 112–15 (2019).



3. Aditi Sahay & Gauri Kanodia, *Analyzing the Implication of Trademark and Copyright in Cyberspace* (2025).
4. Trademark Infringement in Cyberspace, **IJLMH** (2022).
5. Passing Off in the Digital Era, **SSRN** (2024).

V. Websites and Online Resources

1. Manupatra, *Cyber Space and Trademark Infringement: Issues of Domain Names and Passing Off*, <https://docs.manupatra.in>.
2. Fenwick & West LLP, *Trademark Protection in Cyberspace*, <https://assets.fenwick.com>.
3. ICANN, *Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy*, <https://www.icann.org>.
4. Share Samadhan, *Difference Between Transfer and Transmission of Shares*, <https://sharesamadhan.com>.
5. SSRN Electronic Library, <https://papers.ssrn.com>.
6. International Journal of Law, Management & Humanities, <https://www.ijlmh.com>.
