

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Principal Financial Services, Inc. v. Mohd Syamohd Syahrulhrul  
Case No. D2025-5460

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Principal Financial Services, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Neal & McDevitt, United States.

The Respondent is Mohd Syamohd Syahrulhrul, Malaysia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <principaltrading.pro> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 31, 2025. On January 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 5, 2026, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 9, 2026, 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 January 9, 2026.

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 January 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on February 6, 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 is a multinational financial services institution and owns trademark registrations for PRINCIPAL in numerous jurisdictions such as the following:

1. United States Trademark Registration No. 1562541, registered on October 24, 1989; and
2. United States Trademark Registration No. 5074931, registered on November 1, 2016.

The Complainant owns the domain name <principal.com>.

The disputed domain name was created on January 7, 2025, and resolves to a website which displays the Complainant's trademark and logo and purports to offer bitcoin related transactions.

#### **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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant is the owner of the trademark PRINCIPAL. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. The term "trading" does not eliminate the confusing similarity. The Top-Level Domain is a standard registration requirement and should as such be disregarded. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's trademark and logo and purports to offer bitcoin and financial services.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to use its trademark. The Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The disputed domain name resolves to a website which imitates the Complainant and its services.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's trademark is known internationally and was used since at least 1985. The Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark as the disputed domain name resolves to a website which impersonates the Complainant featuring the Complainant's trademark and logo and purporting to offer bitcoin and financial services. A privacy service was used, which is further evidence of bad faith. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's PRINCIPAL marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the associated website and its purported financial services. The Respondent has configured MX (Mail Exchange) records for the disputed domain name, which indicates an intent to use the domain for sending and receiving email.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## **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 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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "trading" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 impersonation/passing off, 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**

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 Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark as the disputed domain name resolves to a website, which displays the Complainant's trademark and logo. It also offers financial services, which is the Complainant's line of business. Also, the Complainant's trademark was registered decades before the creation of the disputed domain name.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, impersonation/passing off, 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.

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 <principaltrading.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Nayiri Boghossian/*

**Nayiri Boghossian**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 11, 2026