

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Justin Gotthardt, Be Easy Trust v. Tomer Babad
Case No. D2025-5193

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Justin Gotthardt, Be Easy Trust, United States of America ("United States"), self-represented.

The Respondent is Tomer Babad, Israel, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <beeasy.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 11, 2025. On December 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 13, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 16, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 18, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 December 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on January 21, 2026. 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 operates a website at “beeasyboards.com”, offering skateboards, clothing, and accessories. The website is titled “Be Easy”.

The Complainant is the owner of United States trademark registration number 5127629 for the word mark BE EASY, registered on January 24, 2017 in International Classes 25 and 28.

The Whois report relating to the disputed domain name records a creation date of December 28, 2024.

The disputed domain name has resolved to a GoDaddy landing page stating that the disputed domain name is for sale.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

It states that it has used the BE EASY trademark continuously since 2010.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical to its BE EASY trademark, save that the space between the two words is absent from the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has never licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its BE EASY trademark, that the Respondent has not commonly been known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the primary purpose of targeting the Complainant's trademark, by attempting to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for a grossly excessive price.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. It states that it was contacted by the Respondent's broker on December 28, 2024, being the same day that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name. It exhibits an email from an individual named “Tasha” at an organization named Overly Media, timed at 12:38 pm on December 28, 2024. The email states:

“Hi, how are you? The domain name beeasy.com is coming for sale. I am checking to see if you have any interest in it. It seems like it could be a good addition to your current domain name. Thanks! Tasha.”

The Complainant replied to the above email offering to purchase the disputed domain name, to which Tasha responded that the disputed domain name would be offered through escrow at a higher price. She added that she was a listing broker and could offer in-house finance for 36 months. The Complainant replied that that was “way too much” and that it would reconsider if the price was lowered.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent's immediate approach to the Complainant in this manner demonstrates that it was aware of the Complainant's BE EASY trademark, and that it registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for an inflated sum.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent submits that he is a legitimate domain name investor, who acquired the disputed domain name by way of a competitive auction. He states that the disputed domain name “dropped” on December 28, 2024 and was placed on an auction platform on that date, hence the Whois creation date. The Respondent exhibits particulars of the auction bidding history, apparently involving over 30 bidders, including his own winning bid on December 31, 2024, and a record that the sale was completed on January 2, 2025.

The Respondent denies that he approached the Complainant on December 28, 2024 and states that he could not indeed have done so, since the auction was still ongoing at that time and he had not yet acquired the disputed domain name. He submits that Tasha was most likely a speculative broker or “scraper”, who was aware of the drop status of the disputed domain name and was seeking to capitalize upon it by prospectively offering it to potentially interested parties.

The Respondent contends that the disputed domain name comprises a generic term in common usage, widely understood to mean “relax” or “take it easy”. He submits dictionary extracts in this regard. He also produces evidence by way of a search at “Open Corporates” that there are over 30 corporations, in the United States and elsewhere, with the term “be easy” or “beeasy” as part of their name, e.g. Be Easy Trucking LLC, Be Easy Salon LLC, and Be Easy Fitness LLC. The Respondent also refers to numerous domain names incorporating the term “beeasy”, e.g. <beeasy.agency>, <beeasy.digital>, and <beeasy.life>.

Concerning the value of the disputed domain name, the Respondent produces evidence of his receipt of an emails from GoDaddy, dated May 8, 2025, May 27, 2025, and June 4, 2025, reporting substantial offers for the disputed domain name. The Respondent contends that these offers demonstrate the significant market value of the disputed domain name, comprising a generic term and independent of the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent denies that he was aware of the Complainant or its United States trademark when he registered the disputed domain name, and submits that it is implausible in any event that a domain name investor located in Israel would target the trademark of a local skateboarding business in Connecticut, United States.

The Respondent requests denial of the Complaint and a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking against the Complainant. He states that the Complainant failed to verify the timeline relating to the Respondent's acquisition of the disputed domain name, and also failed to disclose the ubiquitous nature of the phrase “be easy”. The Respondent adds that, if the Complainant was the party who offered unsuccessfully to buy the disputed domain name from him, then the present proceeding would represent an abuse of process.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established that it has registered trademark rights in the mark BE EASY. The disputed domain name is identical to that mark, the space between the two words in the trademark being immaterial for the purposes of comparison. The first element under the Policy is therefore satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests, and C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds it convenient in this case to consider the second and third elements under the Policy together, since similar considerations will determine its findings in respect of both elements.

The Panel finds that the term “be easy” is a phrase comprising dictionary words, which is in relatively common usage in the English language. It is not an invented term uniquely referable to the Complainant, nor has the Complainant provided evidence that its mark has become widely recognized by the public as referencing its business.

Investment and trading in domain names is not illegitimate per se, and the question for the Panel in this proceeding is whether the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with a view to its legitimate use by a purchaser in connection with its dictionary meaning, or alternatively, in order to target the Complainant’s goodwill attaching to its BE EASY trademark.

The Complainant’s principal argument is that the Respondent approached it on the same day he acquired the disputed domain name, seeking to sell it to the Complainant for a sum well in excess of his costs related to its acquisition. The Complainant relies on this as evidence of both the Respondent’s prior knowledge of its trademark and of the Respondent’s bad-faith intentions. However, the Complainant has not provided direct evidence that the approach made on December 28, 2024 was indeed made by or on behalf of the Respondent, and the Respondent has given a plausible explanation that, the drop status of the disputed domain name having been known, this approach could have been made speculatively by a third-party dealer. (The fact that the Respondent did not win the relevant auction until December 31, 2024 or acquire the disputed domain name until January 2, 2025, is not of course conclusive of the Respondent’s non-involvement, since, on its own case, the Respondent could have been the party who speculatively approached the Complainant.)

The Panel accepts the Respondent’s evidence that the phrase “Be Easy” is used in commerce by a significant number of parties independent of the Complainant, and in a substantial number of domain names unrelated to the Complainant. Moreover, there is no suggestion in this proceeding that the Complainant was the previous owner of the disputed domain name, or indeed its owner at any time. In these circumstances, while the Respondent may well have hoped to attract a buyer connected with the “Be Easy” phrase, the Panel finds no evidence upon which to conclude that the Respondent targeted the Complainant’s BE EASY trademark specifically. While the approach to the Complainant on December 28, 2024 might have been relevant in this regard, on the evidence available the Panel is unable to conclude, on the balance of probabilities, that that approach came from the Respondent as the Complainant has assumed.

In the circumstances, the Panel finds that neither the second nor the third element under the Policy is established in this case.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules 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 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. 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 Complaint in this proceeding appears to have been triggered by the Complainant’s receipt of an unsolicited broker’s approach on December 28, 2024, offering to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant. Given that this date coincided with the creation date for the disputed domain name disclosed by a Whois search, it is understandable that the Complainant may have assumed that the broker represented the Respondent and was targeting its BE EASY trademark specifically. While the Complainant has not been able to prove that scenario, the Panel does not consider that the Complaint was brought in bad faith.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: January 29, 2026