

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SENDINBLUE (BREVO) v. Tahir Nazir, Webhive
Case No. D2025-2262

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SENDINBLUE (BREVO), France, represented by Tmark Conseils, France.

The Respondent is Tahir Nazir, Webhive, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <brevo.email> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 13, 2025. On June 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 16, 2025, 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 (Redacted for privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 17, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the 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 June 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Simone Huser as the sole panelist in this matter on July 11, 2025. 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

The Complainant was founded in 2007 and is headquartered in Paris, France. The Complainant is active in the development of customer relationship management (CRM) solutions, enabling small businesses and SMEs to support their digital transformation.

The Complainant holds the domain name <brevo.com> which hosts its main website.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

- BREVO, French Trademark registration No. 4918999, registered on December 6, 2022, in international classes 9, 35, 36, 38 and 42;
- **Brevo**, French Trademark registration No. 4956542, registered on April 24, 2023, in international classes 9, 35, 36, 38 and 42;
- **Brevo**, European Union Trademark registration No. 018936748, registered on September 2, 2024, in international classes 9, 35, 36, 38 and 42;
- BREVO, European Union Trademark registration No. 018806016, registered on April 29, 2023, in international classes 9, 35, 36, 38 and 42;
- BREVO, International Trademark registration No. 1738724, registered on April 3, 2023, in international classes 9, 35, 36, 38 and 42;
- **Brevo**, International Trademark registration No. 1768052, registered on October 12, 2023, in international classes 9, 35, 36, 38 and 42.

Because the Respondent did not file a response, not much is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 12, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name previously redirected Internet users to the Complainant's website <brevo.com>.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, the Complainant contends as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BREVO trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".email" is not sufficient to avoid confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The trademark BREVO has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its services. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent's use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its trademark BREVO at the time it registered the disputed domain name, given that the disputed domain name automatically redirected users to the Complainant's website. The redirection to the Complainant's website gives the false impression to Internet users that they have reached the Complainant's official website.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, as it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated use of the disputed domain name that would not be illegitimate.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. 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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark 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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".email" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant

evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as here impersonation/passing off the complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its BREVO trademark or to register the disputed domain name incorporating its mark. The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name previously redirected to the Complainant's main website under the domain <brevo.com>.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's *prima facie* showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the disputed domain name previously automatically redirected to the Complainant's website, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The Panel finds that using the disputed domain name for redirection to the Complainant's official website constitutes bad faith. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <brevo.email> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Simone Huser/

Simone Huser

Sole Panelist

Date: July 22, 2025