

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ideatec S.A. v. Mira Holdings
Case No. D2025-2648

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ideatec S.A., Belgium, represented by COGITUS SRL, Belgium.

The Respondent is Mira Holdings, United States of America ("United States" or "US").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ideatec.com> is registered with DropCatch.com LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 7, 2025. On July 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 8, 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/ NameBrightPrivacy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 9, 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 July 11, 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 July 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2025. On August 1, 2025, the Respondent requested a four-day extension to file a Response under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, which the Center granted on August 4, 2025, setting a new due date for Response as August 7, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on August 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Karen Fong, Matthew Kennedy, and John Swinson, as panelists in this matter on September 12, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 is a company established in Belgium in 1997. It is engaged in the design and manufacture of electronic controllers and user interfaces for warning lights, sirens, multiplexers, and other auxiliary equipment used on emergency and intervention vehicles. The Complainant has conducted business in this field for more than 25 years and exports its products to over 20 countries, including in Europe, the Middle East, and Canada.

The Complainant is the owner of European Union (“EU”) Trade Mark Registration No. 018325264 for IDEATEC (stylized), filed on October 23, 2020, and registered on March 11, 2021, covering goods in Classes 9 and 12 (the “Trade Mark”).

The Complainant previously registered and used the disputed domain name <ideatec.com> in connection with its business activities. The Complainant held this domain name since at least 2012 but inadvertently failed to renew it when it expired in March 2023.

The disputed domain name <ideatec.com> was subsequently registered by the Respondent in April, 2023 through a drop-catching service. The disputed domain name has since resolved to a pay-per-click (“PPC”) links parking page. The evidence presented does not show any PPC links that relate to the Complainant or its type of products. The parking page displays a button for enquiries that redirects to a webpage where Internet users are invited to make an offer to purchase or lease the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has also been offered for sale on domain trading platforms including GoDaddy, DomainTools and a Chinese website for domain name auctions.

Based in the United States, the Respondent is a professional domain name investor with more than 1,000 generic domain names under ownership and offered for sale. On January 24, 2024, the Complainant contacted the Respondent seeking to acquire the disputed domain name. The Respondent offered to sell it for USD 25,000. On June 23, 2025, the Complainant’s legal representative sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent, to which no reply was received.

The Complainant now uses the domain name <ideatec.be> for its official website.

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 that:

(1) The disputed domain name is identical to the Trade Mark. The Trade Mark is a coined and inherently distinctive term not found in any dictionary. It is composed of two conceptual elements: “IDEA” and “TEC.” The latter is an abstract syllable open to multiple interpretations and is not an abbreviation of “technology” or “technical,” given the omission of the letter “h” at the end.

(2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Historical records from December 9, 2012, to July 5, 2019, show that the disputed domain name resolved to

the Complainant's website, demonstrating active use and control by the Complainant at that time. After the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name via drop-catching, the domain name was parked for resale. In February 2024, the Complainant offered USD 500 to reacquire the disputed domain name. The Respondent countered with an inflated price of USD 25,000, which is inconsistent with any claim to legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the name "IDEATEC" and holds no trade mark or service mark rights in that term. The Respondent's core business is the purchase, parking, and resale of domain names. There are multiple UDRP proceedings against the Respondent in which it has been accused of cybersquatting. These circumstances do not establish any rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

(3) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant originally registered the disputed domain name in 2004 and used it continuously for its business, which is well known in the field of electronic controllers. The Respondent was therefore aware, or should have been aware, of the Complainant at the time of registration. Even if the Respondent lacked actual knowledge, it failed to take simple steps to avoid infringement. A basic Internet search or a search of trade mark databases would have revealed the Complainant's rights.

Because the domain name was acquired through drop-catching, the Respondent knew or should have known that it was an expiring domain name with a prior history. As a professional domainer, the Respondent had a duty to conduct due diligence, particularly since "IDEATEC" is a coined and distinctive term. A Google search would have shown the Complainant's official website at <ideatec.be> at the top of the results.

The Respondent has previously been involved in UDRP proceedings where such duties have been outlined and thus should have been aware of them. Registering a lapsed domain name formerly associated with a well-established business and seeking to sell it back to the previous owner at an inflated price constitutes opportunistic bad faith, which is widely recognised under the Policy.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends that the disputed domain name has not been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The disputed domain name is composed of the ordinary words "idea" and "tec/tech," which together form a common and widely used business name used by many companies worldwide as shown through various searches.

The Respondent is a professional domain name investor with a portfolio of more than 1,000 generic two-word domains, including many incorporating "Idea" and "Tec/Tech". Comparable sales evidence shows that such domains have significant market value. The Respondent acquired the disputed domain name at public auction for USD 1,801 at "www.dropcatch.com" as part of its legitimate investment strategy of purchasing quality memorable domains for resale, without any knowledge of the Complainant. The price reflected the quality and memorability of the domain name. Similar two-word domain names that the Respondent has purchased at auction in a similar manner include <ideacrate.com>, <ideaboutique.com>, <ideasbiz.com>, <crosstec.com> and <steptec.com>.

Numerous unrelated companies worldwide also use the name “Idea Tec” or “Ideatec,” undermining any claim by the Complainant to exclusivity or targeting. Examples include:

- Idea-Tec, an upcycling company in Chile (est. 2016 “www.idea-tec.cl”)
- Ideatec Advanced Acoustic Solutions SL (“IAAS”) in Spain (est. 2007, “www.ideatec.es”)
- Ideatec in Brazil (est. 2019 “www.ideatec.com.br”).
- Other active domain names include <ideatec.fr> (since 2000), <ideatec.co.kr> (2016), <ideatec.am> (2021), <ideatec.com.tr> (2015), <ideatec.co.in> (2002) and <ideatec.it> (2023).

A trade mark search of the United States Patent and Trade Mark Office (“USPTO”) database, relevant as that is where the Respondent is US-based, revealed no registration for IDEATEC in the Complainant’s name. A search of the WIPO Global Brand Database identified 25 registrations for IDEATEC held by various parties, including multiple IDEATEC registrations in the European Union, Singapore, United Kingdom, Brazil, Canada, United States and China in the name of IAAS, and a Malaysian registration by Mujaya Plastics Industries Sdn Bhd. This demonstrates that IDEATEC is used by numerous entities worldwide.

Since its purchase by the Respondent, the disputed domain name has been parked with a standard “for sale” page, consistent with the Respondent’s bona fide business of reselling generic domains. The Respondent has never used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant, divert its customers, or trade on its reputation. At the time of registration, the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant, a Belgian company with no US trade mark registration or presence.

The Respondent has not targeted the Complainant. The disputed domain name has only ever resolved to a general sales landing page, and the Respondent has never offered it specifically to the Complainant. The Complainant approached the Respondent to purchase the disputed domain name; the Respondent’s quoted price of USD 25,000 was consistent with market valuations and sales for similar domain names. High asking prices do not establish bad faith. UDRP panels consistently find that registering and reselling generic or descriptive terms is legitimate when not aimed at exploiting a specific trade mark owner.

Holding a domain name that is a common English phrase used by multiple businesses worldwide is not bad faith. In such cases, the Complainant bears a heightened burden to show that its trade mark was specifically targeted, which it has failed to do.

The Complainant is attempting to use the UDRP following unsuccessful commercial negotiations with the Respondent to acquire the disputed domain name. The Respondent requests that the Complaint be denied and invites the Panel to make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In the light of its conclusions under the third element of the Policy, below, the Panel does not consider it necessary or appropriate to reach a determination under the second element of the Policy in this case.

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. The burden lies with the Complainant to establish this element on the balance of probabilities.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was acquired through a process commonly referred to as “drop-catching,” whereby a domain name that has not been renewed by its previous registrant is automatically re-registered by a third party using technical means to monitor and secure lapsed names as soon as they become available. Such practices, like other forms of automated domain name acquisition are not inherently illegitimate under the Policy. Whether they give rise to a finding of bad faith depends on the surrounding circumstances, including the nature of the domain name, the respondent’s pattern of conduct, and any evidence of targeting of the complainant’s trade mark. In many cases, drop-catching simply reflects a commercial strategy of acquiring potentially valuable domain names for resale, which by itself does not constitute bad faith under the Policy (see *Datacap Systems, Inc. v. Domain Admin, XYZ Invest LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0858](#)).

The Panel concludes, on this record, that the Complainant has failed to prove that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith under the Policy. As such, the Complaint must fail.

The Respondent acknowledges that it acquired the disputed domain name via a drop-catching service but denies having had any knowledge of the Complainant or its Trade Mark at the time of registration. Previous UDRP panels have sometimes ruled against respondents using drop-catching services, on the basis that employing such services indicates knowledge that the domain name was previously owned and possibly of trademark value. However, not all drop-catching cases lead to a finding of bad faith. Each case must be assessed on its specific facts (see, e.g., *Photomaton v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Ehren Scheiberger*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0593](#)).

In this case, the Respondent has made only general statements about its business practice as a domain investor, focusing on generic, two-word combinations including those incorporating “idea” and “tech” or “tec”. It has referred to reviewing trade mark databases but has not provided clear evidence of any specific searches carried out before registration. It is not apparent whether any such searches were performed contemporaneously or only after the fact. Nevertheless, the mere use of a drop-catching service is not sufficient on its own to establish bad faith. The decisive issue is whether the overall circumstances indicate that the Respondent targeted the Complainant or its Trade Mark.

The Panel observes that the disputed domain name is composed of two ordinary elements and does not correspond to a highly unique or well-known mark. This is not a case involving a coined or fanciful term but rather a combination of common components making it plausible that the disputed domain name was selected for that reason. The relatively non-distinctive nature of the disputed domain name, in the circumstances of the case, diminishes the likelihood that the Respondent registered it with the Complainant specifically in mind.

The evidence also shows that the term IDEATEC is used by various entities around the world, including companies in Spain, Chile, France, and elsewhere, across diverse fields. There is no evidence that the term is uniquely associated with the Complainant, or that the Respondent’s asking price (USD 25,000) was set with the Complainant in mind as the only realistic purchaser. The Respondent’s explanation that it acquired

the disputed domain name because it is memorable and commercially attractive is credible. The Respondent's explanation is affirmed by evidence showing the Respondent selling a domain name comprising the term "tec".

The Complainant has not demonstrated that the Respondent knew or should have known of its Trade Mark at the time of registration. The Complainant has no trade mark registration in the United States nor any apparent business presence there, where the Respondent is based. A USPTO trademark search would not have revealed the Complainant's mark, and a Google search for "ideatec" yields several unrelated businesses. This further supports the conclusion that targeting has not been shown.

Taking these factors together, the Panel is not persuaded that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. On the balance of probabilities, the Complainant has failed to prove bad faith registration. Because of this finding, it is unnecessary for the Panel to address the issue of alleged bad faith use. The Complainant has not satisfied the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

To establish reverse domain name hijacking, the Respondent must demonstrate that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt to deprive a registered domain name holder of a domain name. The Panel is not persuaded that there is sufficient evidence in this case to show that, at the time of filing, the Complainant knew or should have clearly known that it could not prove one of the essential elements of the Policy. The Complainant previously owned the disputed domain name and holds a registered Trade Mark identical to it, and has advanced arguments in support of its position. The fact that the Panel ultimately does not accept those arguments is not, by itself, evidence of bad faith. Nor is there evidence of harassment or similar conduct. This is not a case in which the UDRP has been used in bad faith to attempt to deprive the Respondent of a domain name. Accordingly, the Panel declines to find reverse domain name hijacking.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Karen Fong/
Karen Fong
Presiding Panelist

/Matthew Kennedy/
Matthew Kennedy
Panelist

/John Swinson /
John Swinson
Panelist
Date: September 29, 2025