

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Guillermo Vázquez Álvarez v. Gressus Ventures, Gressus Ventures LLC
Case No. D2026-1482

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Guillermo Vázquez Álvarez, Mexico, represented by Regalado & Galindo Abogados, Mexico.

The Respondent is Gressus Ventures, Gressus Ventures LLC, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gressus.org> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 7, 2026. On April 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 8, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 20, 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 April 23, 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 April 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 15, 2026. A third party sent an email communication to the Center on May 17, 2026.

The Center received unsolicited supplemental filings from the Respondent on May 17, 18, and 21, 2026. The Center received an unsolicited supplemental filing from the Complainant on May 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on May 28, 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.

The Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 on June 5, 2026, inviting the Respondent to comment on a potential inconsistency in the Response, giving the Complainant an opportunity to respond to any response received from the Respondent. The Respondent responded on June 5, 2026, and the Complainant responded on June 15, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is an individual resident in Mexico. Little information is provided in the Complaint concerning the nature of the Complainant's business, other than to state that he began using the GRESSUS trademarks which are the subject of his portfolio of Mexican trademark registrations in October 2015. That portfolio includes:

- Mexican Trademark Registration No. 1793922 GRESSUS LOS PASOS DE LA HISTORIA (and device) in class 9, having a registration date of August 31, 2017, and a usage start date of October 2, 2015; and
- Mexican Trademark Registration No. 2150143 GRESSUS (word) in class 9, having a registration date of September 28, 2020.

According to the Respondent's evidence, the Respondent is a corporation registered in Michigan, United States, incorporated in April 2015. The Respondent is an investment holding company, with investments in software and streaming media in the United States, as well as in a security company in Morocco.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 13, 2017, and presently resolves to a website headed "GRESSUS - Empowering communities for a brighter future", featuring a contact form, which appears to be a Registrar parking page of sort.

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 was registered and has been used in bad faith because the Complainant's GRESSUS mark is a creative and distinctive designation, whose adoption by the Respondent cannot reasonably be regarded as the result of mere coincidence. Thus, the disputed domain name was registered with knowledge of the Complainant's rights, for the purpose of blocking its use by the Complainant and eventually obtaining a commercial advantage.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that it has operated a legitimate business, Gressus Ventures LLC, in Michigan since 2015 and has long used the disputed domain name in connection with that business and related investments. The Respondent further maintains that it registered and has owned the disputed domain name for years without any attempt to target the Complainant's trademark rights, and that the term "gressus" is a common dictionary word having a meaning in Latin associated with walking or stepping.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Procedural Issue - Supplemental Filings

Both the Complainant and the Respondent filed unsolicited Supplemental Filings.

Paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules in effect grant the Panel sole discretion to determine the admissibility of unsolicited supplemental filings. Admissibility of supplemental filings is to be assessed based on relevance, foreseeability, the need to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, and the equal treatment of the parties so that each has a fair opportunity to present its case. Paragraph 10(b) of the Rules; *Société aux Loteries en Europe, SLE v. Take That Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0214](#); WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.6.

The Panel notes that the Respondent filed its Supplemental Filings of May 17 and 18 shortly after the Response deadline, not having filed any Response earlier. The Respondent is unrepresented, and these late filings would not have delayed these proceedings nor prejudiced the Complainant to any significant degree. The Panel also notes that the Respondent's submissions are directly relevant to the question of bad faith and their admission would aid the Panel in assessing that question. It is therefore in the interests of justice to admit those Supplemental Filings.

The Complainant's Supplemental Filing addressed an inconsistency in the Respondent's Supplemental Filings that could not have been anticipated in the Complaint and is admitted to that extent.

The Respondent's Supplemental Filing of May 21 contains nothing new and does not address any of the issues raised by the Complainant in its Supplemental Filing. It is therefore not admitted.

B. 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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Given the Panel's findings in relation to the third element below, there is no need to consider the second element.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

For the following reasons, the Complainant has not met its burden of proving, on balance of probabilities, that it is more likely than not that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant.

The Respondent's evidence shows that it was incorporated, and had already concluded at least one investment agreement, by the end of April 2015, which is earlier than the date that the Complainant claims to have first begun using its mark (in October 2015) and prior to any of the Complainant's trademark applications having been filed. In the circumstances, the Respondent had adopted a company name, Gressus Ventures, LLC, which is dominated by the "Gressus" element, prior to the Complainant itself having adopted its GRESSUS mark and prior to the Complainant obtaining any trademark rights.

Without any evidence from the Complainant to the contrary, it is therefore not possible for the Respondent to have adopted its name with knowledge of and targeting of the Complainant when it did so in 2015.

The Respondent's subsequent registration of a domain name that consists of the dominant aspect of its company name without any intention of targeting the Complainant is therefore quite plausible and indeed likely in the absence of any indicators of targeting.

Apart from noting the identity of its trademark with the disputed domain name, the Complainant has not presented any evidence of targeting.

There is no evidence in the record showing any use by the Complainant of its mark at all. The Panel's independent¹ Internet searches for "gressus" do not return any results relating to the Complainant across the first three pages of results, and reveal many other businesses using this term. There is therefore no indication that the Complainant is known under the GRESSUS mark or that it is unique to it, and, accordingly, no indication that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant, especially given that the Respondent adopted its company name, which is dominated by "Gressus", prior to the Complainant itself adopting the name or obtaining trademark rights. This is especially so given that the Respondent is based in the United States and the Complainant has not presented any evidence of use in that jurisdiction.

The Complainant did raise an inconsistency in the Respondent's filings, namely that it owns <gressus.com> in addition to the disputed domain name. The Panel is the panellist in another simultaneous case involving the Complainant, namely *Guillermo Vázquez Álvarez v. Domain Admin, FindYourDomain*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1481](#). There, the domain name at issue is <gressus.com> and it was revealed to be owned by a party other than the Respondent in this case. There is therefore a potential inconsistency in the Respondent's filings. For this reason, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1, giving the Respondent and the Complainant an opportunity to comment on the potential inconsistency. The Respondent responded by stating: "There is a typo in that response. This is correct. I incorrectly stated I owned gressus.org and gressus.com. Gressus Ventures is a registered organization in Michigan USA and the dispute here is about gressus.org, not gressus.com. I meant to say I own, have owned and want to continue to own gressus.org and this discussion does not involve gressus.com which I do not own, nor have I ever owned nor do I desire to own."

The Complainant's response on this point was to state: "The Respondent's explanation that the prior statement was merely a 'typo' should be treated with caution. The prior communication did not contain an isolated typographical error; it repeatedly referred to both domain names and expressly asserted ownership of both. The correction therefore underscores the unreliability of the Respondent's informal and late submissions."

Although the Respondent does not clearly explain why such a material error might have been made, the Panel notes that the Complainant, in its List of Annexures, states: "This evidence is offered for the purpose of [...] the request for the transfer or cancellation of the domain names gressus.com and gressus.org." This may have been the source of the Respondent's confusion in this respect.

In any event, the Respondent's error does not have much bearing on the question of whether <gressus.org> was registered and used in bad faith and does not undermine the evidence discussed above indicating an absence of targeting. The Panel therefore does not place much weight on the inconsistency in that regard.

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

¹ In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

E. 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 (“RDNH”) 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 RDNH. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

The Panel has considered whether the Complaint was brought in bad faith, as it is entitled to do even though the Respondent has not requested such a finding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16

The Complainant has not provided any evidence on the nature of its business and has supplied no evidence of use of its mark despite claiming to have used it since 2015 in its Complaint. In the simultaneous case of WIPO Case No. [D2026-1481](#) (referenced above), in its Supplemental Filing, the Complainant appeared to admit that it has not actually launched its contemplated project, despite creating the impression that it had by claiming, in the Complaint (as it has done in the present case), to have used its mark since 2015. This suggests a lack of candour on the Complainant’s part in both proceedings.

The Complainant has also made two other statements that suggest a lack of candour. Firstly, the Complainant states that as of the registration date of the disputed domain name, “there already existed a public, notorious, and prior use of the GRESSUS mark” by the Complainant. Given the Complainant’s admission in WIPO Case No. [D2026-1481](#) addressed above and the lack of any evidence to this effect in the record, this appears to be false.

Secondly, the Complainant stated that “gressus” is “not a generic or commonly used term, but rather a creative and distinctive designation” and that it is “highly distinctive and fanciful”. As the Respondent rightly points out, and as the Panel’s Internet searches addressed above reveal, this is plainly not the case. A simple Internet search would have revealed this to the Complainant, and it is likely that the Complainant either knew this or should have known this.

The Panel notes that the Complainant is represented by counsel and that panels do hold represented complainants to a higher standard. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

The Complainant cited numerous prior cases decided under the Policy in the Complaint. A proper consideration of UDRP jurisprudence should have made it clear to the Complainant that it could not succeed without any evidence of targeting, as discussed above. This is so even if one acknowledges that the Complainant could not have known of the Respondent’s prior adoption of its company name. Even without that, there is still a complete paucity of evidence of targeting.

In the circumstances, at best for the Complainant the filing of the Complaint was reckless, at worst it was dishonest. Both eventualities are reproachable.

The Panel finds that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith and constitutes an attempt at RDNH.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied, and a finding of RDNH is made.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: June 16, 2026