



मध्य प्रदेश MADHYA PRADESH

CV 083870

BEFORE THE ARBITRATOR RAJESH BISARIA

UNDER THE

.IN DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY (INDRP)

[NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA (NIXI)]

ARBITRAL AWARD

Date-12.11.2025

Disputed Domain Name: www.jioeat.in

INDRP Case no -2032

THE PARTIES

- (1) The Complainant is Reliance Industries Limited, 3rd Floor, Maker Chambers – IV,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021, India Telephone: +91-22-3555-5000 E-mail:
Sarita.joglekar@ril.com
The Respondent is reliancedomainadminjoi@ril.com



THE DOMAIN NAME AND REGISTRAR**(2)**

- (a) This dispute concerns the domain name **www.jioeat.in**
- (b) The Registrar with whom the disputed domain name is registered is indicated as: Web Commerce Communications Ltd. Telephone: Not Provided, Email: registry@webnic.cc
- (c) This was registered on 20th May 2025

PROCEDURAL HISTORY**(3)**

The NIXI appointed RAJESH BISARIA as Arbitrator from its panel as per paragraph 5(b) of INDRP Rules of procedure	12.09.2025
Arbitral proceedings were commenced by sending notice to Respondent through e-mail as per paragraph 4(c) of INDRP Rules of Procedure, marking a copy of the same to Complainant's authorized representative and NIXI.	13.09.2025
Due date of submission of Statement of Claim by Complainant (instructed by mail dated 13.09.2025)	23.09.2025
Complainant 's response by submitting their Statement of Claim to AT-	
Soft copy	17.09.2025
Hard copy	19.09.2025
Complainant 's response by submitting their Statement of Claim along with all annexures to Respondent- Soft copy - Complainant sent the copy of complaint along with all annexures to Respondent vide their mail dated 17.09.2025. Complainant vide their mail dated 17.09.2025 intimated that – <i>'Pursuant to your instructions, please find attached the soft copies of the captioned Domain Dispute</i>	17.09.2025

Complaint (in PDF and editable format). Also, please find below a Google Drive link to the complete set of annexures (including the notarized Power of Attorney):

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1F3xe1hkgNX-tHrnpqx7iVd_6MHH4QT1s/view?usp=drive link](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1F3xe1hkgNX-tHrnpqx7iVd_6MHH4QT1s/view?usp=drive_link)

Complainant vide their mail dated 22.10.2025 intimated that – Please note that based on the prior discussion with NIXI, given the name of the Registrant as per its Whois extract is that of the Complainant itself and the address of the Respondent is incorrect / non-existent, the Complainant was advised to proceed ahead in the matter while serving Respondent on its identified email id viz. reliancedomains.adminjio@ril.com. Consequently, the Respondent is duly marked through its said email id on all communications including in the email dated 17.09.2025 vide which the soft copies of the captioned Domain Dispute complaint along with the annexures in support thereof were shared pursuant to your directions. The proof of the same is also attached herewith.’

22.10.2025

Hard copy –

Complainant vide their mail dated 22.10.2025 intimated that - ‘Please note that based on the prior discussion with NIXI, given the name of the Registrant as per its Whois extract is that of the Complainant itself and the address of the Respondent is incorrect / non-existent, the Complainant was advised to proceed ahead in the matter while serving Respondent on its identified email id viz. reliancedomains.adminjio@ril.com. Consequently, the Respondent is duly marked through its said email id on all

communications including in the email dated 17.09.2025 vide which the soft copies of the captioned Domain Dispute complaint along with the annexures in support thereof were shared pursuant to your directions. The proof of the same is also attached herewith.'

AT observed that even though as per the WHOIS Report the Respondent name Reliance Industries Limited was mentioned, the address 5 TTC Industrial area Thane Belapur Road, Ghansoli, Mumbai, Maharashtra, 400701 was different as that of the Complainant and it was his duty to serve the notice rather than presuming that the address is incorrect / non-existent.

Due date of submission of Statement of Defense by Respondent as instructed by AT mail dated 13.09.2025 and as instructed by AT mail dated 21.10.2025	04.10.2025 23.10.2025
Respondent's response by submitting their Statement of Defense against the due date of submission as 04.10.2025 and thereafter 23.10.2025	Not submitted
Complainant's response by submitting their Rejoinder	Not required
The language of the proceedings	English

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

(4) The Complainant:

The Complainant is Reliance Industries Limited, Address: 3rd Floor, Maker Chambers – IV, Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021, India, Telephone: +91-22-3555-5000, Fax: Not Provided, Email: Sarita.joglekar@ril.com



The Complainant's authorized representative in this administrative proceeding is:

Ajay Sahni & Associates, Advocates, Address: 31/42 Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi 110026, Telephone: +91 11 41032782, Fax: +91 11 41022982, Email: postbox@asahni.co

The Complainant's preferred method of communication directed to the Complainant in this administrative proceeding is:

Electronic-only material:

Method: ankitsahni@asahni.co

Address: 31/42 Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi 110026

Contact: Mr. Ankit Sahni

Material including hardcopy:

Method: Courier

Address: 31/42 Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi 110026

Fax: +91 11 41022982

Contact: Mr. Ankit Sahni

(5) The Respondent:

The Respondent is reliancedomainadminjoi@ril.com

(6) Complainant's Activities:

The Complainant has submitted his activities but the same is not reproduced here due to the observations mentioned in para (16) (iv) below.

(7) Complainant's Trade Marks and Domain Names:

The Complainant has submitted his Trade Marks and Domain Names but the same is not reproduced here due to the observations mentioned in para (16) (iv) below.



(8) Respondent's Identity and activities:

Respondent failed to submit their Statement of Defense, so their identity and activities are not clear.

(9) Response by Respondent:

No Response.

(10) Rejoinder by Complainant:

Since the Respondent failed to submit their reply to the Complaint of Complainant, so Rejoinder was not required to be submitted by Complainant.

THE CONTENTIONS OF COMPLAINANT**(11) The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights:**

The Complainant has submitted his contentions but the same is not reproduced here due to the observations mentioned in para (16) (iv) below.

(12) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name:

The Complainant has submitted his contentions but the same is not reproduced here due to the observations mentioned in para (16) (iv) below.

(13) The domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith:

The Complainant has submitted his contentions but the same is not reproduced here due to the observations mentioned in para (16) (iv) below.

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS**(14) Submission of Complainant**

No other legal proceedings have been initiated by the Complainants against the Respondent as yet.

REMEDY SOUGHT**(15) Submission of Complainant**

In accordance with Paragraph 10 of the Policy, for the reasons mentioned hereinabove, the Complainants humbly request the Ld. Sole Arbitrator appointed in these proceedings that the domain name 'www.jioeat.in' be transferred to the Complainant forthwith without any cost or consideration. Any other relief(s) against the Respondent and in favour of the Complainant may also be awarded, as deemed fit by the Ld. Arbitrator.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS**(16) By going through the pleadings of the complainant, following are the observations:**

- (i) Prior to the appointment, the NIXI asked to submit 'no conflict of interest' vide their mail dated 29.08.2025 and thereafter in consent requisition letter vide their mail dated 03.09.2025, the name / title of the parties to the dispute domain under INDRP policy was mentioned for Respondent as **reliancedomainadminjoi@ril.com**

Subsequently the appointment letter was issued vide email dated 12.09.2025 wherein the email id **reliancedomainadminjoi@ril.com** mentioned as Respondent and copy of this mail was given to this email id also (Respondent).

The complaint submitted by complainant mentioned the Respondent by name of **John Doe** (without any address and contact details).

Therefore it is clear that the Respondent doesn't have any name and is known by their mail ID i.e. reliancedomainadminjoi@ril.com and presuming Respondent name is not in consonance with NIXI above communication

- (ii) In the appointment (of the AT) issued by NIXI vide email dated 12.09.2025 (copy of email endorsed to complainant and respondent both), the copy of WHOIS was also attached (3 pages), which has following information-

Field	Value
DNS Form	jioeat.in
User Form	jioeat.in
ROID	D3452D93901CB4904B294A42447A3AD79-IN
Domain Status	Registered
Registrar IANA ID	460
Registrant Contact ID	wn56742134t
Registrant ROID	C0476874B948D431F84BB0B9E48B7870A-IN
Email	reliancedomains.adminjio@ril.com
Phone	+91.2244773818
International Postal Name	Reliance Industries Limited
International Postal Organization	Reliance Industries Limited
International Postal Street Line 1	5 TTC Industrial area Thane Belapur Road, Ghansoli
International Postal City	Mumbai
International Postal State	Maharashtra
International Postal Postcode/Zip Code	400701
International Postal Country	IN
Local Postal Country	India

Registrant Registrar Name	Web Commerce Communications Ltd.
---------------------------	----------------------------------

The complainant email dated 22.10.2025 mentions that address of the Respondent is incorrect / non-existent.

Thus from the above, the averment of complainant that identity of Respondent is not known does not seems to be plausible rather it was his duty to serve the notice instead of presuming that the address is incorrect / non-existent without providing any proof of service.

- (iii) Complainant submitted Domain name complaint with pages 1 to 25 comprising words 4800 and annexures from A to P from pages 26 to 494 i.e. total of 469 pages.

As per, the INDRP Rules of Procedure, Rule 4(a) – *“The (maximum) word limit shall be 5000 words for all pleadings individually (excluding annexure). Annexure shall not be more than 100 pages in total. Parties shall observe this rule strictly subject to Arbitrator’s discretion.”*

The appointment letter issued by NIXI via email dated 12.09.2025 (which was sent to all concerned parties) clearly stated the following in the relevant NOTE:

“Please also ensure that the domain complaint word limit and the documents pages numbers limit are as per the limit prescribed under Rule 3 of the INDRP Rules of Procedure.”

Despite this clear directive, the Complainant’s authorized representatives have failed to comply with the prescribed annexures limit of 100 pages under Rule 4(a) of the Rules. However, in the present case, the annexures exceeds the permitted page count by approximately 369%, which constitutes a significant deviation from the permissible limit of 100 pages under Rule 4(a) of the Rules.

Accordingly and in the absence of any application seeking prior permission or justification for such deviation, the Arbitral Tribunal hereby declines to accept the Complaint in its present form.

- (iv) Since, as per the findings and conclusion in above paras (16) (i) to (16) (iii), the Arbitral Tribunal has declined to accept the Complaint in its present form therefore it does not deem necessary to examine the Complainant's submissions with regard to establishment of INDRP Clause 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c).

(17) ARBITRAL AWARD

I, **Rajesh Bisaria**, Arbitrator, having duly examined the pleadings and carefully considered the documentary evidence and submissions presented by the parties and having applied judicial mind to the facts, materials & circumstances of the case, do hereby render and publish this Award in accordance with Rules 4(a), 5, 17, and 18 of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution (INDRP) Rules of Procedure and Clause 11 of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution(INDRP) Policy, in the matter concerning the disputed domain name “**www.jioeat.in**”, as under:

In view of the above and the findings as per above para 16, the Arbitral Tribunal declines to accept the Complaint in its present form. Accordingly, the Complaint is DISMISSED on procedural grounds.

AT has made and signed this Award on 12.11.2025 (Twelfth Day of November, Two Thousand Twenty-Five).

Place: Bhopal (India)

Date: 12.11.2025



(RAJESH BISARIA)

Arbitrator