

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Euronet Worldwide, Inc. v. Euronet Internet
Case No. D2024-0293

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Euronet Worldwide, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Eversheds Sutherland (Netherlands) B.V., the Kingdom of the Netherlands .

The Respondent is Euronet Internet, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, represented by IP Twins, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <euronet.com> is registered with NORDNET (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 23, 2024. On January 24, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 26, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name, which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 7, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 8, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 28, 2024. The Response was filed with the Center on February 19, 2024.

The Center received supplemental filings from the Complainant and the Respondent, respectively on February 29, and March 1, 2024.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on March 5, 2024. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

Since starting in Central Europe around 1994 (according to its website), the Complainant has provided payment-related products and services in various countries under the marks EURONET and/or EURONET WORLDWIDE including ATMs, point of sale services, credit/debit card services and currency exchange.

The Complainant's subsidiary, EFT Services Holding B.V., owns a number of trade marks for EURONET including:

- Benelux trade mark No. 427092, registered on February 18, 1987, in classes 36 and 38;
- Spanish trade mark No. M2915825, registered on May 13, 1989, in classes 36 and 38;
- Swedish trade mark No. 214058, registered on June 9, 1989, in class 36; and
- Norwegian trade mark No. 142769, registered on September 13, 1990, in classes 36 and 38.

The Complainant operates a website at "www.euronetworldwide.com".

According to its website, the Complainant launched a new visual identity early in 2023, changing its logo from EURONET WORLDWIDE to EURONET.

As regards the Respondent, according to Wikipedia: "Euronet" / "Euronet Internet" (exact company name not stated) was founded in 1994 as one of the first commercial Internet service providers; it became a subsidiary of France Telecom in 1998; it was branded "Wanadoo" for consumers in 1999 but remained "Euronet" for the business market; thereafter Wanadoo became Orange which became Online.nl; T-Mobile used the network from 2007 to 2013; in 2013, the business was sold to M7, part of Canal+.

The domain name <euronet.nl> (i.e., not the disputed domain name) was registered on June 26, 1994, and is currently owned by "Capitar IT Group B.V". This domain name is the subject to a separate complaint filed by the Complainant under the applicable domain dispute resolution policy.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 16, 1994. As of 2001 it was registered to the current registrant "Euronet Internet" with a registrant address in Amsterdam that was virtually identical to the current address. In 2001, the administrative contact was shown as Euronet Internet B.V. ("EIBV").

According to a Dutch Chamber of Commerce screenshot, EIBV has undergone a number of statutory and trading name changes which largely appear to reflect the acquisitions of the company by the various telecommunications brands. In summary: EIBV was incorporated at some point before April 6, 1995 (exact date not given). On July 25, 1996, it changed its name to Euronet Internet B.V. Thereafter, the company underwent further name changes, namely Wanadoo Nederland B.V. (2002), Orange Nederland Breedband B.V. (2006), Online Breedband B.V. (2008), T-Mobile Netherlands B.V. (2010), and Odido Netherlands B.V. (2023).

As discussed in Section 6E below, the alleged relationship, or otherwise, between EIBV and a different company called Euronet Communications B.V. ("ECBV") has become a major issue between the parties. ECBV was incorporated on March 26, 1998, as Brucop Netherlands B.V. Following various name changes, it became T-Mobile Netherlands B.V. in 2003, Tulip B.V. in 2008 and Euronet Communications B.V. on June 1, 2013. According to ECBV's LinkedIn page: it previously offered a wide range of Internet, television and VOIP services under the names "Orange Breedband" and "Wanadoo"; it had built up considerable expertise in the Dutch Internet industry over 20 years; in 2013, its brands Online.nl, Euronet Internet and Canal Digitaal gave access to more than 500,000 users; Online.nl was part of the M7 Group; and, for more information, users should visit the website at the disputed domain name.

The following two figurative International Registrations for EURONET INTERNET (“the Expired Marks”) were registered in 1997/1998:

- No. 680098, registered on August 14, 1997, in classes 9, 37, 38, and 42; and
- No. 699227 (comprising stylised words “EURONET INTERNET” plus a red star (“the Red Star Logo”)), registered on August 19, 1998, in classes 38, 41, and 42.

The Expired Marks lapsed respectively on August 14, 2017 (No. 680098) and August 19, 2018 (No. 699227). At the time of their expiration, they were owned by ECBV.

According to Archive.org screenshots from 2001, 2003, and 2007, the disputed domain name formerly resolved to a website that offered webhosting services and was branded with the Red Star Logo. In 2001, the company name EuroNet Internet BV appeared in the footer. By 2003, this had changed to Wanadoo Nederland BV, and the footer stated: “EuroNet Internet is part of Wanadoo Nederland BV”. In 2007, the footer referred to “Over EuroNet”, and the homepage content indicated that the business was now part of Orange.

Archive.org screenshots from 2014, 2018, 2021, and 2022 show the disputed domain name resolving to a corporate information page headed “euronet communications BV”, with a different logo, which was described as the technical network company behind the brand “Online.nl”. The 2018 to 2022 screenshots also refer to Canal Digitaal and the M7 Group.

On February 15, 2023, the Complainant emailed a representative of the Respondent, stating:

“I am the General Counsel of Euronet Worldwide Inc., an international payments company based in Leawood, Kansas.

I understand that you represent the owner of the domain name euronet.com, and that the owner may be willing to entertain an offer to sell the domain name. If that is the case, we would be interested in engaging in a discussion of the terms of such a sale.”

The Respondent’s representative responded on February 16, 2023, stating that “I am starting a process to sell this domain name on behalf of the owner and will consider your proposal”. On February 16, 2023, the Complainant forwarded that email to the Benelux director of Epay, a company connected with the Complainant.

In an email of January 18, 2024, the Epay director stated that “... I have also reached out ... by telephone, asking if he would be interested to sell the domain name to us... I have mentioned an amount of [USD] 25 K or [USD] 30 K and asked if offering such an amount would get us the domain. He answered that he expected to get significantly more for it. I have followed up this call several times, but never received any further feedback from him.”

The disputed domain name does not currently resolve to a website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- the Complainant is a worldwide provider of “global telecommunication and payment services”;
- the Complainant’s marks are well known;
- the disputed domain name long post-dates the Complainant’s trade marks;
- neither the Respondent nor any connected entity is commonly known by the disputed domain name nor any corresponding name;
- passive holding of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, irrespective of past use;
- the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith, irrespective of whether the Respondent was the original holder;
- the Respondent registered or acquired the disputed domain name solely with the intention of selling it to the Complainant or a competitor of the Complainant “or any third party”;
- the disputed domain name was originally registered by EIBV, which “ceased to exist” in 2002, whereas an Archive.org screenshot (from 2021) shows that the website was most recently used by ECBV, a different and unconnected entity located in a different city in the Netherlands, that was acquired by Canal+ in 2020, and the disputed domain name was no longer used after that acquisition, demonstrating that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to sell it to a competitor of the Complainant;
- a contact of the Respondent “reached out” to the Complainant in early 2023 to sell the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent intends to disrupt the Complainant’s business as it had no reason to register the disputed domain name other than to obtain the most money from the highest bidder and the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct in that (a) the nameserver for the domain name <euronet.nl> is at <ns.euronet.com> and (b) it previously redirected to <home.euronet.nl> which was operated by the Respondent, making it plausible that the Respondent previously owned <euronet.nl> and sold it to its current owner, which is clearly using the domain name in bad faith – and the Respondent has thereby acquired multiple domain names containing the trade marks to resell them for the highest possible amount, so preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trade marks in the corresponding domain names;
- since it was sold, the domain name <euronet.nl> has resolved to a page containing links to third party goods and services, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s marks, and it is highly likely that similar inadvertent use will arise in relation to the disputed domain name;
- any active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent’s successor, Odido, in relation to telecommunications services will infringe the Complainant’s trade marks;
- the Respondent “ceased to exist” more than two decades ago and has deliberately neglected to update the ownership register of the disputed domain name in order to conceal its identity, thereby obstructing the Complainant, which made multiple efforts through the Registrar to obtain the registrant’s contact details and ultimately had to initiate this proceeding to acquire accurate contact details; and
- the Complainant denies reverse domain name hijacking (in its supplemental filing) on the grounds that: the disputed domain name was registered more than seven years after the Complainant registered its first trade mark; the Complainant has extensively explained substantiated its assertion that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith: it is not the Complainant who is employing the UDRP as a

backup plan to obtain the disputed domain name but rather the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name solely to sell it at the highest possible price, despite lacking any legitimate interest in it; and the Complainant has never included incorrect information in its Complaint to mislead the Panel but has diligently sought all pertinent information and presented it accurately to the best of its knowledge.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has failed to satisfy all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends that:

- “Euronet Internet” and “Euronet Communications B.V.” are alternate names for the same company;
- having been acquired by the M7 Group, part of Canal+, ECBV now mainly trades as “Online.nl” and for that reason it willingly allowed the Expired Marks to lapse;
- the following constitute rights and legitimate interests: the Expired Marks, ECBV’s corporate name and ECBV’s use of the EURONET and EURONET INTERNET marks for a bona fide offering of goods or services for over 20 years;
- the evidence shows that the Complainant is wrong to claim that ECBV is not linked to Canal+;
- the Complainant’s trade marks are not inherently distinctive or liable to create a monopoly as the term “euronet” combines the generic terms “euro” related to Europe and “net” related to the Internet, and it is registered worldwide for a variety of goods or services;
- the disputed domain name is currently in active use for email in connection with ECBV’s services;
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 1994, and has been using it in good faith since then, notwithstanding that the company has since been acquired by other companies;
- there is nothing to indicate that that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of selling it to the Complainant or a third party;
- the Respondent’s business does not compete with that of the Complainant;
- the Complainant’s submission that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name solely with the intention of selling it is fanciful in that it is based on emails dated almost 30 years after the registration of the disputed domain name and that it was the Complainant who chased the Respondent to try and acquire the disputed domain name, stating that it followed up the call several times;
- nothing on the record shows that the Respondent actively tried to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant;
- nothing on the record shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to target the Complainant, whether at the time of registration or in the decades that followed; and
- the Complainant has been guilty of reverse domain name hijacking in that: the Complainant selectively picked from the publicly-available evidence, deliberately omitting crucial evidence including as to the Respondent’s lapsed trade mark rights and its use for legitimate good faith commercial activity; the Complainant has filed a “plan B” complaint having been unsuccessfully attempted to buy the disputed domain name from the Respondent; the Complainant misleadingly introduces itself as a worldwide provider of global telecommunication as well as payment services; the Complainant’s attempt to buy the disputed domain name from the Respondent in 2023 was likely motivated by its rebrand at that time; and the

Complainant's separate complaint in relation to <euronet.nl> shows that the Complainant is engaging in a fishing expedition to try and deprive the Respondent of valuable assets registered rightfully and in good faith.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Language of the Proceeding - Preliminary Issue

The Complainant has been submitted in English.

Pursuant to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the default language of the proceeding is the language of the registration agreement, subject to the authority of the panel to determine otherwise. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1.

In this case, the language of the registration agreement is French. However, the parties have agreed that the language of the proceeding should be English.

B. Supplemental Filings – Preliminary Issue

Each party has made an unsolicited supplemental filing.

Paragraph 10 of the UDRP Rules vests the panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition.

UDRP panels have repeatedly affirmed that the party submitting an unsolicited supplemental filing should clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response, e.g., owing to some "exceptional" circumstance. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.6.

In this case, the Panel admits the Complainant's supplemental filing insofar as responds to the allegation of reverse domain name hijacking in the Response. See a summary of those submissions in Section 5A above. The Panel declines to admit the remainder of the Complainant's filing, as well as that of the Respondent, on the grounds that the material covered is either repetitive of the party's primary pleading, or constitutes standard rebuttal, or the Panel considers that it is irrelevant to the issues that the Panel needs to decide.

The Panel would add, however, that even if the disallowed material had been admitted, it would have made no difference to the outcome of this case.

C. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has produced evidence of trade marks for EURONET owned by its subsidiary, and of a power of attorney from the subsidiary entitling the Complainant to enforce those trade marks. Furthermore, the Respondent has not contested the Complainant's rights in those trade marks. In these circumstances,

the Panel considers that the Complainant can rely on the trade marks for the purpose of standing to file the Complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.4.1.

Accordingly, the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

D. Rights or Legitimate Interests

It is unnecessary for the Panel to consider this element in view of the Panel's conclusion under the third element below.

E. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The first issue is to establish the relevant date of acquisition of the disputed domain name for the purpose of assessing registration in bad faith.

The Respondent, which identifies itself as ECBV, contends that it acquired the disputed domain name on its creation date, November 17, 1994. Indeed, that fits with the 1994 founding date for the "Euronet Internet" business per the Wikipedia page mentioned in Section 4 above. The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with hosting/telecommunications services throughout most of its long existence and that the registrant name and address for the disputed domain name have remained unchanged since 2001.

Nonetheless, the Complainant invokes the ECBV corporate information page from 2021 (in fact that use dates back to at least 2014) and argues strongly that ECBV is unconnected with EIBV. The Complainant's position appears to be that, although the registrant of the disputed domain name has not changed since 2001, ECBV should nonetheless be somehow treated as an independent acquirer of the disputed domain name, and that bad faith should be assessed as of the date of ECBV's alleged later acquisition, whenever that occurred.

In the Panel's view, both parties have become too fixated on which of these two corporate entities should be treated as "the Respondent". If it were necessary to specifically link the Respondent to either company, then EIBV is the better candidate, given that ECBV was not incorporated until 1998 and that EIBV was identified as the administrative contact of the disputed domain name.

However, the disputed domain name was registered in connection with a business that became the subject of multiple takeovers, and it is no surprise that different group companies operated the website at the disputed domain name at different times and that those companies frequently changed their names/addresses. In the Panel's view, the key issue as regards the timing of acquisition of the disputed domain name is not so much to identify a particular corporate entity upon which to pin the registrant name "Euronet Internet" but whether, on the balance of probabilities, the disputed domain name has likely remained under the ultimate control of the same business throughout. And the evidence before the Panel strongly indicates that it has.

Not only has the disputed domain name generally been used in connection with hosting/telecommunications services for most of its existence, as mentioned above, but the Panel considers that the Complainant is wrong to claim that there is no evidence linking ECBV with the business previously being conducted at the website at the disputed domain name. First, ECBV was the last owner of the Expired Marks, which included the exact Red Star Logo that had appeared on the website at the disputed domain name from 2001 to 2007. Second, as indicated by the respective corporate histories in Section 4 above,

both ECBV and EIBV became part of the T-Mobile group at various times. Third, ECBV has held itself out as being connected with the “Euronet Internet” business that operated for over 20 years, clearly referring to the same business originally conducted by EICV. See e.g., the LinkedIn page referred to in Section 4 above, which mentions the previous ownership by Orange and Wandadoo. Fourth, the Wikipedia page states that, in 2013, the “Euronet Internet” business was sold to M7/Canal+, which features on the ECBV’s corporate information webpages between 2018 and 2022.

Accordingly, the Panel is proceeding on the basis that the disputed domain name has remained under the ultimate control of the same business since 1994.

In those circumstances, and for the following reasons, the Panel considers that the Complainant has fallen well short of establishing that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

First, the Complainant has provided the Panel with no reason to think that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name for any purpose other than the supply of the hosting/telecommunications services for which the disputed domain name was in fact used for much of its 30-year history and which are distinct from the Complainant’s payment-related services.

Second, the term “euronet” is a fairly obvious combination of the dictionary words “euro” and “net” and, as one might expect, the Respondent has produced evidence of a vast number of third-party trade marks for this term.

Third, not only has the Complainant provided no evidence regarding the extent of its own reputation, but its website also indicates that it only started trading in 1994, the same year that the disputed domain name was registered, albeit that the Complainant owns some prior trade marks dating back to 1987.

Fourth, as regards paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, the evidence produced by the Complainant does not support its claim that it was the Respondent who “reached out” to the Complainant to sell the disputed domain name in 2023. Rather, the correspondence indicates that it was the Complainant that made the first approach: “I understand that you represent the owner of the domain name <euronet.com>, and that the owner may be willing to entertain an offer to sell the domain name...” Even if the Respondent had made the first move, such a step, taken 30 years after the disputed domain name was registered, and following many years of active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent in a different industry to the Complainant, would not have been suggestive of any illicit motive of the Respondent to vis-à-vis the Complainant. Indeed, it seems likely that, as it says, the Respondent’s amenability to sale of the disputed domain name arose purely from the fact that it had decided after many years to cease actively trading under the EURONET mark.

The Panel would add that, even if the disputed domain name had been more recently acquired by an unrelated entity (whether in 2021, based on the screenshot supplied by the Complainant, or in 2014, when use by that entity apparently started), the Complainant would still have failed to establish registration (or indeed use) in bad faith for similar reasons to those given above.

Finally, the Panel will deal with some additional submissions by the Complainant:

- That EIBV “ceased to exist” in 2002 and that the Respondent thereby “purposefully neglect[ed]” to update the ownership register of the disputed domain name in order to conceal its identity. The EIBV corporate history printout supplied by the Complainant indicates only that EIBV changed its name on that date, not that it ceased to exist. In any case, there is no evidence whatever of any attempted concealment of ownership.
- That the Respondent’s dealings with the domain name <euronet.nl> are somehow indicative of a bad faith pattern of acquiring domain names for illicit resale. The Panel does not fully understand the Complainant’s contentions in this respect but, in any case, they appear highly tenuous and are not supported by clear evidence. The Panel would add that it has disregarded the domain dispute resolution complaint

relating to this domain name supplied by the Complainant, because it was not translated from Dutch into the English, the agreed language of the proceeding.

- That the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name for sale simply to “a third-party”. Leaving aside the lack of any evidence that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name for sale at all, the Panel notes that registering a domain name for resale independently of a trade mark owner is not, of itself, an illegitimate practice. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1. In this respect, the Complainant has departed from the text of paragraph 4(b)(i), which is concerned with registration for resale to a complainant or competitor.

- That the disputed domain name may in future be used to resolve to a page with links to third-party goods and services that create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s marks and/or to infringe the Complainant’s marks. Such speculation is irrelevant to the question of whether the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith 30 years ago (or indeed more recently). In any case, trade mark infringement is a matter for a court; this Panel is concerned only with the bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

F. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Policy provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (“RDNH”) or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. RDNH is defined under the Rules as “using the UDRP in bad faith to attempt to deprive a registered domain-name holder of a domain name”. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

The reasons articulated by panels for finding RDNH, as set out in section 4.16 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), include the following:

1. facts which demonstrate that the complainant knew it could not succeed as to any of the required three elements – such as clear knowledge of a lack of respondent bad faith;
2. facts which demonstrate that the complainant clearly ought to have known it could not succeed under any fair interpretation of facts reasonably available prior to the filing of the complaint, including relevant facts on the website at the disputed domain name or readily available public sources such as the Whois database;
3. the provision of intentionally incomplete material evidence – often clarified by the respondent; and
4. filing the complaint after an unsuccessful attempt to acquire the disputed domain name from the respondent without a plausible legal basis.

In the Panel’s view, all of the above factors are present here.

First, at around the time it announced a rebrand from EURONET WORLDWIDE to EURONET, the Complainant unsuccessfully attempted to acquire the disputed domain name without making any assertion of legal rights, and thereafter filed this case without any plausible legal basis.

Second, the Panel thinks it is highly likely that the Complainant, which has clearly examined the relevant corporate background in detail, was well aware of at least some of the matters outlined above that indicate that ECBV and EIBV were connected, and of the likelihood that there has been no material change of ownership of the disputed domain name since its creation.

Third, the Complaint has failed by a large margin. Irrespective of any recent change of ownership, the Complainant knew or should have known that it had no prospect of succeeding in the circumstances of this case, including the longstanding use of the disputed domain name in a different industry, the lack of any reputation evidence from the Complainant, the lack of any evidence of targeting and the fact that the disputed domain name reflected a relatively combination of dictionary terms in use by many other business.

Fourth, the Complaint lacks candour in a number of respects:

- The Complainant misleadingly describes itself as “a worldwide provider of global telecommunication and payment services”, whereas in reality it appears to be focused on payment services.
- The Complaint misleadingly states that the Respondent “reached out” to the Complainant to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant, whereas the reverse appears to be the case.
- The Complainant, which has plainly reviewed the archive history of the website of the disputed domain name, failed to produce any evidence of the former extensive active use of the disputed domain name in connection with hosting/telecommunication services; the Complainant has simply selected a single screenshot showing the later corporate information use of the disputed domain name in 2021, and indeed has omitted the archive screenshots indicating that this usage dated back to at least 2014.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied. Moreover, the Panel finds that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith and constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: March 26, 2024