

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BV Law Firm TechLaB - Technology Law Boutique v. Venu Olis, Venu Olis Case No. D2025-3799

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BV Law Firm TechLaB - Technology Law Boutique, Belgium, represented by PIERSTONE, Belgium.

The Respondent is Venu Olis, Venu Olis, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 18, 2025. On September 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 18, 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 (“Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 October 2, 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 October 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 3, 2025.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on November 4, 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 is a law firm that has traded under the name “Technology Law Boutique” since 2015.

The Complainant uses the domain names <technologylawboutique.com> and <techlawboutique.com> to provide technology law services. According to these websites, the Complainant has offices in Brussels, London and the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 17, 2025.

The Respondent did not file a Response, so little information is known about the Respondent. According to the Registrar’s records, the Respondent has an address in Alaska, United States.

The website at the disputed domain name includes information about the Respondent. For example, it refers to the Complainant’s company name, its Belgium company number and its office address in Brussels. The contact email address on the website at the disputed domain name is not an email associated with the Complainant.

The Complainant has been receiving messages, emails and documents by several means, including forged agreements naming Mr. Erik Daems as ‘Managing Director’ of a fictitious entity ‘TechLaB LLP.’ The Complainant has received inquiries and telephone calls from individuals in the Russian Federation and elsewhere. Unknown Russian individuals also contacted the President of the (Brussels) Bar Association to make complaints about alleged illegal activities linked to the Complainant’s company.

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 Internet users viewing <tlawb.com> are likely to perceive it as an abbreviated or shorthand version of <techlawboutique.com> and <technologylawboutique.com>, thus creating a strong likelihood of confusion.

The Respondent’s domain name has been registered and used in bad faith, with the sole purpose of impersonation and deception.

The fake website at the disputed domain name has been used to present fictitious agreements and correspondence, falsely identifying Mr. Erik Daems as Managing Director of ‘TechLaB LLP.’ Fraudulent contracts and communications sent from addresses connected with [...]@tlawb.com have been circulated, as evidenced by the forged agreement and fake passport submitted to the Complainant. The pattern of deception also includes repeated fraudulent communications from individuals using Russian contact details (WhatsApp messages, emails), falsely presenting the Complainant’s law firm as a party to fictitious legal services. This constitutes identity theft and demonstrates that the disputed domain name was registered with fraudulent intent, in order to obtain unlawful financial gain, mislead clients, and damage the Complainant’s reputation and professional integrity.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a 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.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3.

For example, the Complainant has operated as a law firm using the brands "Technology Law Boutique" and "Tech Law Boutique" for between five and 10 years.

The disputed domain name comprises "tlawb" which is a shortening of the Complainant's marks.

It is well established that the content of the Respondent's website is normally disregarded when assessing confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. The test is to be conducted by way of a side-by-side comparison of the Complainant's mark and the disputed domain name. *Harry Winston Inc. and Harry Winston S.A. v. Jennifer Katherman*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1267](#).

However, in certain circumstances, it is permissible for the Panel to consider the website at the disputed domain name to gain an indication of the intended meaning of the disputed domain name. See *Zippo Manufacturing Company v. Domains by Proxy, LLC and Paul Campanella*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0995](#), cited with approval in *VF Corporation v. Vogt Debra*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2650](#); and *Gravity Co., LTD. and Gravity Interactive, Inc. v. Domain Privacy Service FBO Registrant / Junior Silva*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2648](#); *Fenix International Limited v. Nemanja Krecelj / Nemanja Krecelj, Rocket Science Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2667](#); *Fenix International Limited v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC / yossri ben salah, to leaks*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0872](#).

In the present case, the Panelist reviewed the website at the disputed domain name and can draw the conclusion that the content of the website confirm confusing similarity since it appears prima facie that the Respondent sought to target the Complainant's trademark through the disputed domain name. The reference to "t" in the disputed domain name is clearly a reference to "technology" and "b" is clearly a reference to "boutique". See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.15.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar 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.

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.

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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, (here, claimed impersonation) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark (usually) owned by the complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant, most likely for fraudulent purposes. Clearly, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name, and selected the disputed domain name to take advantage of the Complainant and its mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity or illegal activity (here, claimed impersonation which appears to be part of a fraudulent scheme) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Compare, for example, *KWM Brands Pte Limited, King & Wood Mallesons v. Whois Agent, Whois Privacy Protection Service Inc. / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1721](#); and *Bristows LLP v. Protection of Private Person / Marilyn Steele*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0685](#)

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 <tlawb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: November 18, 2025