

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BIZNET DOO v. Demir Hasanovic

Case No. DME2025-0035

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BIZNET DOO, Serbia, internally represented.

The Respondent is Demir Hasanovic, United States of America, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <biznet.me> is registered with eNom, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 9, 2025. On December 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 10, 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 (Proxy Protection LLC (DreamHost privacy service)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 17, 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 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 11, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on December 19, 2025.

On December 21, 2025, the Center received the Complainant's unsolicited Supplemental Filing submitted by email. On December 24, 2025, the Center received the Respondent's objection to the Complainant's aforementioned Supplemental Filing. On January 12, 2026, the Center informed the Parties of the commencement of the panel appointment process. On January 12 and 13, 2026, the Center received the Respondent's supplemental filings submitted by email. On January 14, 2026, the Center received the Complainant's supplemental filings submitted by email.

The Center appointed Stefan Bojovic as the sole panelist in this matter on January 14, 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 Serbian company active in the field of information technologies and telecommunications. According to the Complainant, it has been using the trademark BIZNET in the course of its business since 2004.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registration for the BIZNET trademark:

- Serbian trademark registration No. 80086 (Application No. Ž 2020/0916) for BIZNET, registered on March 31, 2021 and covering goods and services in classes 9, 35, and 38.

The Respondent is an individual who is the director, legal representative, and majority shareholder of the Serbian company Biznet Solutions d.o.o., which provides SaaS platform and digital marketplace offering tools for internet visibility and scheduling.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 8, 2025. It resolves to a website offering services related to searching for local businesses based on various criteria, such as location, industry sector, and geographic proximity.

The Parties have informed the Center of ongoing litigation before the Commercial Court in Belgrade, Serbia. The proceedings were initiated by the Complainant against Biznet Solutions d.o.o. and concern alleged infringement of the Complainant's BIZNET trademark. In those proceedings, the Complainant seeks, inter alia, a finding of trademark infringement, an order requiring the defendant to change its business name and domain name, injunctive relief against further infringement, publication of the judgment, and reimbursement of legal costs.

The Complainant also requested the issuance of a preliminary injunction prohibiting the defendant from using the disputed domain name pending a final decision on the merits. Based on the evidence submitted by the Respondent, the court rejected the request for a preliminary injunction. The proceedings on the merits are currently ongoing.

5. Parties' Contentions

The Parties, in their respective submissions, have raised numerous contentions concerning parallel court litigation in Serbia, additional legal proceedings, and various mutual accusations (including, inter alia, allegations of unpaid taxes, the filing of SLAPP criminal complaints, operation of Ponzi schemes, harassment and online stalking, serial litigation, and sabotage). As the vast majority of these arguments fall outside the scope of the present proceeding, the Panel will address in this section only those arguments that are relevant under the Policy.

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, with respect to the first element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is identical to its BIZNET trademark. According to the Complainant, the addition of the “.me” country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) is legally irrelevant for the purpose of the comparison, pursuant to section 1.11 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”).

Regarding the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has never been commonly known by the name “BizNet” or “BizNet Solutions” and has not acquired any trademark rights in that designation. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is purely commercial and designed to exploit the Complainant’s brand recognition. According to the Complainant, such use cannot qualify as fair use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, nor as a legitimate noncommercial use, because the Respondent offers commercial software and services, uses a name identical to the Complainant’s distinctive trademark, and intentionally creates a likelihood of confusion among consumers familiar with the Complainant’s telecommunications and IT services.

With respect to the third element of the Policy, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 8, 2025, long after the Complainant had established trademark rights and public recognition in the “BIZNET” name. Relying on section 3.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Complainant asserts that the registration of a domain name identical to a long-standing trademark constitutes strong evidence of bad faith. The Complainant emphasizes that it is the owner of a registered Serbian word mark BIZNET and has continuously operated under that name for many years. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark, differing only by the “.me” ccTLD, which, according to the Complainant, does not prevent confusion and evidences deliberate targeting. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent intentionally used the disputed domain name to publish a software application and online platform branded “BizNet”, thereby creating confusion as to source, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Complainant additionally contends that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name directly overlaps with the scope of the Complainant’s trademark protection, that the Respondent has prevented the Complainant from securing the “.me” ccTLD corresponding to its trademark, and that such conduct forms part of a broader pattern of misappropriating the Complainant’s business identity in Serbia. According to the Complainant, the Respondent operates in the same or closely related fields, namely IT, software, and telecommunications, and its adoption of a confusingly similar name is demonstrably disruptive. Finally, the Complainant asserts that there is evidence of intentional passing off, noting that the Respondent used identical branding, presented itself as “Biznet Solutions d.o.o.”, used the disputed domain name as its official developer website, and targeted Serbian users, who constitute the Complainant’s primary market. The Complainant characterizes this conduct as a textbook example of bad faith mirroring and identity hijacking.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the present UDRP proceeding should be suspended or terminated pending the outcome of the related litigation in Serbia. In this regard, the Respondent provides information concerning the ongoing court proceedings, including the Commercial Court’s rejection of the Complainant’s request for a preliminary injunction.

The Respondent further denies that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, asserting that there are material differences between the Parties that preclude any likelihood of consumer confusion. According to the Respondent, these differences relate to, inter alia, the Parties’ respective visual identities (including different logos), business models (offering different services), and targeted audiences.

Finally, the Respondent submits that the Complainant has engaged in a pattern of abusive litigation and trademark bullying and requests a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

C. Supplemental Submissions

In an unsolicited supplemental submission dated December 21, 2025, the Complainant provided counter-arguments to the Respondent's contentions raised in the Response. In particular, the Complainant emphasized that differences in the Parties' logos are irrelevant, as the Complainant owns a word mark for BIZNET. The Complainant further argued that the Respondent's assertions regarding differences in services in fact confirm that the Respondent's activities fall within the classes for which the Complainant's trademark is registered. The Complainant also submitted evidence that, since 2008, it has operated a website at the domain name <obrenovac.biz>, through which it offered services allegedly similar to those provided by the Respondent, albeit limited to small and medium-sized enterprises and professionals located in the municipality of Obrenovac, Serbia. The Complainant additionally rejected the Respondent's allegations of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking as unfounded.

On December 24, 2025, the Respondent submitted an objection to the Complainant's supplemental submission and requested that the Panel deny its admission and strike it from the record.

The Respondent subsequently filed two unsolicited supplemental submissions dated January 12 and January 13, 2026, in which it provided what it described as "urgent updates" and new evidence that it asserted had not been previously available. These submissions included information regarding the filing of a criminal complaint against the Complainant's director, as well as the filing of a takedown notice by the Complainant that resulted in the removal of the Respondent's recruitment advertisement from a social media platform.

The Complainant filed an additional unsolicited supplemental submission, described as a "final urgent update", in which it provided counter-arguments to the allegations raised in the Respondent's above-referenced supplemental submissions and submitted further evidence. This additional evidence related to further takedown actions initiated by the Complainant and their outcomes.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Supplemental Submissions

Neither the Policy nor the Rules provide the parties with an automatic right to submit additional arguments or evidence. Pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Rules, panels are vested with broad discretion to conduct administrative proceedings, provided that the parties are treated with equality and that the proceedings are conducted in an expeditious manner. Within this framework, a panel may, in its sole discretion, determine whether to admit or disregard unsolicited supplemental submissions. In addition, under paragraph 12 of the Rules, a panel may request further statements or documents from either party.

In the present case, each Party filed two unsolicited supplemental submissions, resulting in a total of four such submissions. The Panel has accepted these submissions only to the extent that they are relevant to the determination of the scope of the dispute under the Policy, as discussed in further detail below.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Although, at first glance, the present dispute may appear to fall within the scope of the UDRP, the Panel considers that the case, at its core, raises issues that are more appropriately addressed in civil proceedings including trademark and other claims and which the Complainant has not demonstrated can be resolved within the limited scope of the Policy.

Trademark infringement disputes may sometimes overlap with cases of cybersquatting or abusive domain name registration and thus fall within the scope of the UDRP. A distinction in some cases lies in the role of the respondent's intent. In many jurisdictions, trademark infringement is assessed objectively and may exist irrespective of whether the alleged infringer was aware of the complainant or intended to target the complainant's trademark. By contrast, under the UDRP, a finding of bad faith registration and use generally requires evidence that the respondent was aware of the complainant and intentionally targeted the complainant's trademark through the registration of the disputed domain name.

Determining trademark infringement typically involves complex factual and legal assessments, often requiring the production of extensive evidence, hearings, and examination of witnesses. As noted by previous panels, the Policy was adopted to deal as is with the problem of cybersquatting, the registration of domain names consisting of, including, or confusingly similar to marks belonging to another for the purpose of profiting from the goodwill associated with said marks. The questions under the Policy to be addressed by the Panel are often relatively simple and straightforward. The proceeding is a summary one, without the benefit of confrontation of the witnesses, or even of a hearing (*Jason Crouch and Virginia McNeill v. Clement Stein*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1201](#)).

The Panel acknowledges that this is a borderline case and that, on the surface, the dispute may appear suitable for determination under the Policy. However, the disputed domain name forms only one aspect of a broader and more complex trademark dispute between the Complainant and the Respondent's company, Biznet Solutions d.o.o., which is currently pending before the courts of Serbia. That broader dispute raises issues such as the similarity of the services offered by the Parties, the relevant channels of trade, and the strength and scope of the Complainant's trademark, i.e., matters that would require detailed factual findings. As reflected in prior UDRP decisions, evaluating the Complainant's claim would require the Panel to make findings as to, inter alia, the strength of the Complainant's trademark, and the channels of trade of the parties' respective services. This is a matter for a civil court and not one for this Panel (see, in particular *Innovative Research Technology, Inc v. 513 Ventures, LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2861](#) and *Data Parrot Holdings, LLC v. Christopher Hamoen*, WIPO Case No. [DAI2024-0072](#)). As stated in earlier jurisprudence, the Panel is not a general domain name court, and the Policy is not designed to adjudicate all disputes of any kind that relate in any way to domain names (*The Thread.com, LLC v. Jeffrey S. Poploff*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1470](#)).

The Panel further notes that, although the Complainant has framed its arguments using language drawn from the Policy, a substantial portion of these arguments is grounded in considerations more typical of trademark infringement analysis. In particular, the Complainant places significant emphasis on the classes of goods and services for which its BIZNET trademark is registered, while providing no evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant or its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name or that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant through the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant's position largely relies on the coexistence of the Parties within the broader information technology sector and the existence of the Complainant's trademark prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. While relevant in infringement proceedings, such considerations are not, in themselves, sufficient to establish bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

The Panel also observes that both Parties have devoted substantial argumentation to parallel litigation in Serbia and to other legal proceedings between them, matters that have only limited relevance to the narrow questions to be determined under the Policy.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel considers that a court of competent jurisdiction is better equipped to address all aspects of the dispute between the Parties, given the availability of robust fact-finding mechanisms such as hearings, witness examination, and cross-examination. The existence of ongoing proceedings before the Commercial Court in Belgrade, Serbia (the jurisdiction in which both Parties operate) further reinforces the Panel's view that such court constitutes the more appropriate forum for resolution of the dispute.

The Panel is also mindful that each Party submitted two unsolicited supplemental submissions, introducing additional evidence, arguments, and counter-arguments beyond the Complaint and the Response. This procedural history further illustrates that the dispute is of such nature that does not lend itself to effective resolution within the relatively straightforward framework of the Policy, which permits supplemental submissions only in exceptional circumstances.

The Complainant remains free to pursue its claims in other fora, as it has already done. For the avoidance of doubt, the Panel emphasizes that the present findings are confined strictly to the application of the Policy and are not intended to prejudge or influence any ongoing or future judicial proceedings.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Panel notes that the Respondent, in its Response, has explicitly requested a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

As stated above, this is a complex and multi-claim case, and the Panel considers that the Complainant has genuine, albeit ultimately broader, trademark concerns, which it has also pursued in another forum. The Panel finds no evidence that the Complainant brought the present proceeding in an abusive manner.

The Respondent's request for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking is therefore denied.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Stefan Bojovic/

Stefan Bojovic

Sole Panelist

Date: January 29, 2026