

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

anyformat sl v. Jesvin Jose
Case No. D2026-0007

1. The Parties

Complainant is anyformat sl, Spain, represented internally.

Respondent is Jesvin Jose, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <anyformat.com> (hereinafter “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Annulet LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 2, 2026. On January 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On January 16, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 8, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on January 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on January 26, 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

Complainant, a company incorporated under the laws of Spain, has developed AI based services to automate the extraction of information contained in documents, presentations, or voice recordings so that the information can be used in applications such as Excel or business intelligence platforms.

Complainant registered the domain name <anyformat.ai> on February 18, 2024, and began using ANYFORMAT as a trademark (hereinafter the “Mark”) for its information extraction service at some point that year.

On October 7, 2024, Complainant publicly announced that it had raised 520,000 EUR in “pre-seed financing.” This was covered in “EU Startups”.

On September 10, 2025, Complainant filed Trademark Application Serial Number 019258545 with the European Intellectual Property Office to register a figurative version of the Mark, but the registration was not approved prior to the date Complainant filed its Complaint in these proceedings and the application is still pending.

On November 27, 2025, Complainant publicly announced that it had raised 3.3 million EUR in additional seed financing. This was covered by “Unidad Editorial Información Económica S.L.”

On November 30, 2025, Respondent purchased the Disputed Domain Name, which was originally registered by a third party in 2009.

On December 3, 2025, Respondent contacted the Chief Technology Officer of “www.iLovePDF.com” to explore a relationship whereby visitors to the website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolved (the “Disputed Website”) would be directed to “www.ilovePDF.com”, which would provide the functionality to convert uploaded files to the PDF format.

According to an undated screenshot that Complainant submitted as evidence with the Complaint, the Disputed Website’s landing page that described a service that allows users to convert files from one format (such as Excel), to another, such as PDF, stating: “anyformat ai converter : Europe’s Fastest and Easiest Way to Convert Any File to any format”.

If a user selects the option to convert a file format, he is redirected to a separate website “www.ilovepdfs.com” where the functionality (conversion to PDF format) is performed.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends:

- That Complainant has acquired common law rights by virtue of its use of the alleged trademark since 2024.
- That Respondent reproduced with “similar messaging” Complainant’s landing page, which then directs users to third-party websites that offer tools to convert various formats into PDF format indicating a low-effort, repurposed landing page rather than a bona fide offering.
- That [a]lthough the domain name was originally created in 2009, Complainant submits that Respondent materially reactivated and repurposed the domain name in a manner specifically targeting Complainant and its ANYFORMAT Mark after Complainant’s rights accrued

- That Sections 3.8.1 and 3.8.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), support the assertion that "where a respondent acquires a domain name or engages in a relevant change of use after a complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels assess bad faith at the time of such acquisition or re-targeting."
- That "Panels have consistently held that bad faith use, even where registration predates trademark rights, satisfies paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy when the domain is used to target Complainant."
- That, with an intent to profit, Respondent contacted Complainant to discuss the sale of the Disputed Domain Name, after copying Complainant's website.

B. Respondent

Respondent argues that Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy and contends that:

- At the time of the purchase, Respondent had no knowledge of Complainant, its business, or its domain name <anyformat.ai>, and had no notice of any dispute.
- Respondent selected the Disputed Domain Name because "any format" is a common descriptive phrase widely used in the technology sector to denote compatibility or conversion between multiple file formats.
- Respondent's sole intention was to build a legitimate platform using a descriptive, search-friendly name to attract "organic users."
- Shortly after acquisition, Respondent launched a landing page using the tagline "Any file to any format", which is standard descriptive language in the file- conversion industry.
- Respondent has never listed the Disputed Domain Name for sale, never advertised it for sale, and never solicited any buyer.
- Respondent did not initiate any communications proposing a sale of the Disputed Domain Name. It was a broker representing Complainant who initiated communications via email on December 21, 2025, inquiring about Respondent's interest in selling the Disputed Domain Name. Although Respondent contacted Complainant on December 30, 2025, about the broker's prior inquiry, and advised that he was open to discussions, he did not make a demand or propose a price.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has not shown rights in respect of a trademark or service Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Complainant contends that it has unregistered rights, but it has not submitted sufficient evidence to support this claim. "Specific evidence supporting assertions of acquired distinctiveness should be included in the complaint; conclusory allegations of unregistered or common law rights, even if undisputed in the particular UDRP case, would not normally suffice to show secondary meaning." [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3. Complainant submitted evidence of two public announcements (a year apart) relating to its receipt of seed funding, but this evidence does not substantiate, much less quantify, any interaction with customers. Complainant does not offer, for example, any evidence of the quantity of its sales (in units or value), marketing, or geographic range. Consequently, the evidence is insufficient to support a finding of unregistered rights.

While there may be additional evidence the Complainant could have provided, and while its rights may eventually vest assuming its application proceeds to registration, the Panel finds based on the evidence provided, the first element of the Policy has not been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a Disputed Domain Name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on 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 Respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has not established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The evidence does not support Respondent’s contention that Respondent reproduced with “similar messaging” Complainant’s landing page ...” To support its allegation, Complainant submitted as an annex to the Complaint an undated screenshot of the landing page of the Disputed Website at some time before the Complaint was filed. This screenshot does not reflect a reproduction or copy of Complainant’s landing page. There is no literal copying of any text or image, and Respondent’s text describes the conversion of file formats, not the extraction of data using AI tools. Complainant does not identify any “similar messaging” and, regardless, the accusation is too vague to be tested.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Complainant also failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith. Respondent denies any knowledge of Complainant or its trademark when it purchased the Disputed Domain Name. This denial is plausible because Complainant has offered no evidence about the extent of its reputation. In the absence of any evidence about the scale of Complainant’s activities under its nascent Mark there is little basis for the Panel to reject Respondent’s claim that he did not know about Complainant or its trademark when he purchased the Disputed Domain Name. See *Davis Companies Inc. v. Mitchell Embrey*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2083](#). Moreover, Respondent has submitted evidence that several unrelated third parties use the phrase “any format converter” to describe services that assist users to change the format of digital files. This evidence indicates the plausibility of Respondent’s assertion that he registered the Disputed Domain Name based on its descriptive connotations.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

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.

Panels finds that Complainant has provided “false evidence, or otherwise attempt[ed] to mislead the Panel ...”. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.18(iv). The Panel focuses on Complainant’s contention that Respondent “attempted to sell the domain name to Complainant” and that with “intent to sell for profit: Respondent contacted Complainant to discuss the sale of the Disputed Domain Name, after copying Complainant’s website ...”. As noted above, there is no evidence that Respondent “copied Complainant’s website”. This failed contention is not enough to warrant a finding of RDNH, but the further contention that Respondent contacted Complainant to propose a sale is misleading. Complainant submitted as evidence Respondent’s benign December 30, 2025, email message that simply acknowledged a prior communication from “a broker you had appointed.” Importantly, Complainant did not deny that it had previously appointed a broker to contact Respondent, even though the assertion that it had appointed a broker was made in the email that Complainant attached to the Complaint.

In support of its response, Respondent submitted a copy of an email dated December 21, 2025, from a broker representing an anonymous buyer described as “a startup working on AI-related Products and services.” The broker asked whether Respondent would consider selling the Disputed Domain Name. This email does not identify Complainant, but Respondent asserts that this email was from the broker to which he referred in his December 30, 2025, email to Complainant.

The evidence supports the conclusion that Complainant initiated communications to discuss a sale of the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, there is no evidence that Respondent ever proposed a price or made any demand. Complainant’s allegations to the contrary are at a minimum misleading if not false. It was also misleading for Complainant to submit a copy of Respondent’s December 30, 2025 email without acknowledging, denying, or clarifying its prior communications with Respondent via the broker.

The Panel finds that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith and constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. The Panel emphasizes that this finding is based on Complainant advocacy of misleading evidence. The Panel acknowledges that the timing of Respondent’s acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name may have caused Complainant to suspect foul play, but this is not an excuse Complainant’s reliance of misleading evidence.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: February 9, 2026