

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pepperstone Operations Pty Ltd v. xu shuaiwei
Case No. D2026-0014

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Pepperstone Operations Pty Ltd, Australia, represented by IntegriShield, United States of America.

The Respondent is xu shuaiwei, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <peppersone.com>, <pepperstoe.com>, <pepperston.com>, and <peppestone.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 5, 2026. On January 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Privacyguardian.org llc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 6, 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 amended Complaint on January 7, 2026.

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 January 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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

The following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a well-known provider of financial services, specializing in online trading (foreign exchange, CFDs, and related financial products). Founded in 2010 in Melbourne, Australia, the Complainant has grown into a global financial services company.

The Complainant operates its official website at “www.pepperstone.com”, which is a financial-based, lending e-commerce site and has used the PEPPERSTONE name and mark in commerce since at least 2015.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the name PEPPERSTONE in various jurisdictions, including International Trademark Registration No. 1263493 for PEPPERSTONE, registered on July 16, 2015, in Class 36. It also owns trademark registrations for combined word / device marks including the element PEPPERSTONE in China.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

<peppersone.com>	November 26, 2018
<pepperstoe.com>	November 26, 2018
<pepperston.com>	October 3, 2018
<pepestone.com>	August 21, 2016

The Complainant claims that at the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain names redirected to a third-party financial trading platform. At the time of drafting the Decision, all the disputed domain names resolved to inactive webpage, except for one, which redirected to the same platform.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following:

The disputed domain names are trafficking users based on the established business that the Complainant has generated using the PEPPERSTONE trademark, establishing a confusingly similar mark to the Complainant's established mark.

The disputed domain names were registered in bad faith after the Complainant built a financial e-commerce brand with the use of PEPPERSTONE. The websites to which the disputed domain names resolve are promoting a questionable crypto service that traffics users.

The disputed domain names are clearly misspellings of the Complainant's established PEPPERSTONE trademark and domain name.

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 names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names, which are clearly misspellings of the Complainant's mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 registered the disputed domain names after the Complainant had established and registered its PEPPERSTONE trademark.

Furthermore, as one of the disputed domain names resolved to a financial trading platform, it is clear the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant. Given the composition of the four disputed domain names, all registered by the Respondent, the Respondent could not credibly have been unaware of the Complainant's rights. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, as it is the case for some of the disputed domain names, would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names and the fact that one of the disputed domain names was used for redirection to a financial trading platform, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of some the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. The Panel also notes that the Respondent has been involved in a number of adverse UDRP actions against it, which in the circumstances of this case points to a pattern of bad faith conduct. See, e.g., *Vantage International Holding Limited v. xu shuaiwei*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2004](#), and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and used in bad faith.

The Panel thus 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 names <peppersone.com>, <pepperstoe.com>, <pepperston.com>, and <peppestone.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: March 3, 2026