

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Florent Poussier v. TopDomains, Pawel Szablowski
Case No. D2026-1326

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Florent Poussier, France, self-represented.

The Respondent is TopDomains, Pawel Szablowski, Poland, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <transfer.now> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 27, 2026. On March 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 1, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 27, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on April 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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 French individual. According to the Complaint, it provides file transfer services.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for TRANSFERNOW (the “TRANSFERNOW trademark”):

- the French trademark *TransferNow* with registration No. 4066453, registered on September 26, 2014 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 38 and 42; and
- the European Union Trade Mark **transfernew** with registration No. 016659261, registered on August 22, 2017 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 38 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 27, 2024. It resolves to a landing webpage that offers it for sale for a price of USD 299,888.

The Respondent is a Polish domain name investment company. Its website is located at the domain name <top.domains>, and offers for sale various domain names.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its TRANSFERNOW trademark, because it fully incorporates the trademark. The Complainant notes that the use of the “.now” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) reinforces the similarity, as the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety. The Complainant points out that its trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by more than a decade.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorised to use the TRANSFERNOW trademark. The Complainant states that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, and maintains that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, because it resolves to a landing page offering it for sale.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant notes that its TRANSFERNOW trademark was registered ten years before the registration of the disputed domain name. It notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage offering it for sale for a price of USD 299,888, far exceeding any reasonable out-of-pocket costs. The Complainant adds that prior to the filing of the Complaint the Respondent offered the disputed domain name for sale for USD 64,988, but following the Complainant’s inquiry, the price was significantly increased. According to the Complainant, this demonstrates a clear intent to sell the disputed domain name for valuable consideration in excess of documented costs, which constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. The Complainant maintains that the use of a domain name brokerage service further supports the conclusion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for resale purposes.

B. Respondent

The Respondent states that it is a professional domain name investment company based in Poland, and is engaged in the business of acquiring and holding premium domain names composed of dictionary terms for their inherent value, independent of any trademark targeting. According to the Respondent, the registration and retention of domain names, including those containing common words or phrases, is a legitimate practice provided that it is not carried out with the intention of targeting a particular trademark holder. The Respondent categorically denies any such intention with respect to the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

The Respondent states that the disputed domain name was not registered in bad faith, because at the time of its acquisition, the Respondent had no knowledge of the Complainant or its business. The Respondent notes that the Complainant does not appear to have significant worldwide recognition and is not widely known in Poland, where the Respondent is located.

The Respondent submits that the disputed domain name was registered based on its intrinsic value as a dictionary term combined with a strong Top-Level Domain ("TLD"), and as part of the Respondent's standard investment activity. The Respondent maintains that the name "TransferNow" appears to have generic qualities, as both "transfer" and "now" are widely used dictionary words that also have an apparent synergy. The Respondent adds that there are several companies named TransferNow worldwide in addition to the Complainant's company.

The Respondent maintains that the term "TransferNow" is not uniquely associated with the Complainant and can be used by multiple independent entities in different contexts. According to the Respondent, no single entity can claim exclusive rights to all domain names incorporating "TransferNow", particularly where such domain names have not been registered in bad faith.

The Respondent notes that the Complainant's company appears to be related to file transfer services, but, according to the Respondent, one can "transfer" not only files, but also money, assets, credits, points, ownership, energy, etc. The Respondent adds that it has previously had a DJ company expressing interest in the disputed domain name. According to the Respondent, the disputed domain name is not limited to a single potential purchaser, and could be used by many types of companies that are not related to file transfer services and whose activities would not interfere with the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent adds that there is nothing on the landing page of the disputed domain name that may suggest a potential use for file transfer services. The Respondent notes that the background of this landing page conveys video game-like and energy- or power-related themes.

The Respondent maintains that the disputed domain name should not be automatically equated with domain names in the form of <transfernow.[TLD]> or with "TransferNow" as a brand. According to it, it is now standard practice in new gTLDs such as ".now", ".app", or ".trade" not to incorporate the TLD into the brand name.

The Respondent notes that for the disputed domain name, it would be up to its owner to decide whether to choose "Transfer.now", "TransferNow", or simply "Transfer" as its brand name. If the chosen brand is "Transfer", the ".now" gTLD would function as a brand space that elevates the brand, similarly to how ".com" and other TLDs usually function. The Respondent adds that it has recently acquired the domain name <escape.now>, and according to it, "Escape" is a much stronger brand choice than "EscapeNow".

The Respondent maintains that the fact that a domain name is offered for sale, even at a high price, does not in itself constitute evidence of bad faith under the Policy. The Respondent points out that the Complainant did not disclose the full email correspondence that was exchanged between them, and made misleading and false statements in relation to this correspondence. The Respondent notes that the full record of this correspondence shows that the Respondent stated that it would be willing to accept an offer in the USD 30,000 – 40,000 range for the disputed domain name. The Complainant, however, failed to make such an offer. The Respondent also denies that it increased the price of the disputed domain name because of the Complainant's inquiry. According to it, the increase reflects its growing belief in and strategic vision for the ".now" TLD, in which it is one of the world's largest private investors. This development is supported by several factors, the most tangible of which being its success in ".now" domain name sales, which currently exceed USD 250,000, as can be verified by reviewing top ".now" sales on "www.namebio.com". The Respondent also notes that it does not make sense to increase the price to USD 299,888 because of an inquiry from a buyer who was not willing to make an offer higher than USD 10,000. The Respondent explains that the Complainant inquired anonymously about three domain names and did not make it clear which of them was of actual interest. The price increase was entirely unrelated to the inquiry, and by increasing the price, the Respondent never expected to conclude a sale with that particular inquirer.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The gTLD ".now" and the second-level portion of the disputed domain name "transfer", in combination contain the Complainant's trademark TRANSFERNOW. The Panel considers the disputed domain name in its entirety for purposes of assessing confusing similarity, and finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.3.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Panels have accepted that aggregating and holding domain names (usually for resale) consisting e.g., of acronyms, dictionary words, common phrases, or unique/catchy or memorable terms (alone or in combination) can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the UDRP where the respondent can show that the purpose of the registration was not to target a trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates two dictionary words – "transfer" and "now". These words, alone and in combination, are capable of being used for a variety of independent purposes. The Complainant has rights in the TRANSFERNOW trademark, but its rights do not preclude the possibility of using "transfer" and "now" for legitimate activities that do not fall within the scope of protection of the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent has shown that there are third parties unrelated to the Complainant that use "Transfer Now" as their names, and there are probably many other entities around the world that use "transfer" alone or in combination with other words as their names or brands. This makes the disputed domain name a desirable domain name of potential interest and value to a large number of unconnected entities unrelated to any trademarks, "a premium domain name", as the Respondent puts it, that has investment value for domain investors.

As long as the disputed domain name is being used in a way that does not trade off the complainant's trademark (whether to host links, content, a landing or sales page, or hosting no content at all), and where there are no other indicia of cybersquatting, such use may support the respondent's claim to a right or legitimate interest. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10.1.

The evidence in the case does not support a finding that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant or has otherwise engaged in cybersquatting with the registration of the disputed domain name and its offering for sale.

The Complainant has not provided any evidence about the scope, extent, and public recognition of its TRANSFERNOW brand, and there is nothing in the case file to support a conclusion that it is more likely than not that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's mark when registering the disputed domain name, especially considering that it is a natural combination of two dictionary words.

The Respondent's website at <top.domains> offers for sale many other domain names that also appear as natural combinations of dictionary words, such as <share.now>, <text.now>, <speed.now>, <go.now>, <play.now>, <bet.now>, <handsome.now>, <reborn.now>, <romance.now>, <girlfriend.now>, <chat.bot>, <fake.news>, <connect.app>, <for.sale>, <stock.trade>, <free.network>, <smart.world>, <solar.homes>, <adventure.world>, <holiday.travel>, <bio.science>, <quick.link>, <coin.trade>, <job.network>.

<smart.finance>, and so on. This supports the Respondent's explanation that it is a domain name investor specialising in domain names composed of dictionary terms and that it acquired the disputed domain name for this same reason.

The landing page to which the disputed domain name resolves has no content referring to the Complainant or to file transfer services (the Complainant's business). Its design is very similar to the landing pages to which the other domain names listed above resolve, and all of them are being offered for sale at substantial prices.

The contact between the Parties was initiated by the Complainant. The full correspondence exchanged between the Parties, as submitted by the Respondent, shows that the Complainant did not disclose its identity, that it expressed interest in three different and unrelated domain names, and that it was not ready to make an offer for the disputed domain name for more than USD 10,000. There is therefore no reason to conclude that the initial price indicated by the Respondent took into account the identity of the Complainant and its trademark, or that the increase of the price to USD 299,888 (as indicated on the landing page of the disputed domain name) has any connection with the fact that the Complainant had previously expressed interest to purchase it.

In these circumstances, the fact that the Respondent offers the disputed domain name for sale at a substantial price does not indicate an absence of rights and legitimate interests. If a domain name is legitimately held and the registrant is not targeting a trademark owner, it is well established that there is nothing inherently wrong in asking a high price for it.

Considering all the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has shown that it has a legitimate interest in holding the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant has failed to establish the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's TRANSFERNOW trademark.

As discussed in the section on rights and legitimate interests, the disputed domain name has an inherent investment value and is potentially attractive to a multitude of entities that may be engaged in activities unrelated to the Complainant's business. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered and used it targeting the Complainant's trademark. In these circumstances, nothing prevents the Respondent from asking for it a substantial price. There is no support for a finding that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has failed to establish the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: May 18, 2026