

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nothing Technology Limited v. Matlab Aslanov Maharram
Case No. DAE2026-0005

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nothing Technology Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Motsnyi IP Group, Serbia.

The Respondent is Matlab Aslanov Maharram, Azerbaijan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nothing.ae> is registered with AE Domain Administration (.aeDA) (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 18, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to AE Domain Administration (.aeDA) a request for registrant verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 24, 2026, AE Domain Administration (.aeDA) 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 UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy for – UAE DRP approved by .aeDA (the “Policy”), the Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the “Rules”), and the Supplemental Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was April 19, 2026. The Respondent submitted its Response on March 30, 2026. On the same date, the Center sent an email communication to the Parties informing them that they may request a suspension of the proceeding for settlement purposes. On the same date, the Respondent sent an email communication. On March 31, 2026, the Complainant requested a continuation of the proceeding. On April 20, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that it will proceed with Panel appointment.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on April 24, 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 British consumer electronics company founded in 2020. It develops and markets smartphones, audio products, and related software. The Complainant launched its first product, transparent wireless earbuds, in July 2021. In 2022, the Complainant introduced its first smartphone. In 2024, the Complainant had surpassed USD 1 billion in lifetime sales, making an annual revenue of over USD 500 million and selling more than 7 million devices. The Complainant's channel on YouTube has 1.23 million subscribers, its account on Instagram has 1.6 million followers, and its TikTok account has 1.2 million followers.

The Complainant's official website is located at the domain name <nothing.tech>.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for NOTHING (the "NOTHING trademark"), including the following representative registrations:

- the United Arab Emirates trademark NOTHING with registration No. 349690, registered on August 8, 2021, for goods in International Class 9;
- the European Union trademark NOTHING with registration No. 018344807, registered on February 24, 2022, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, and 42; and
- the United Kingdom trademark NOTHING with registration No. UK00003547196, registered on April 8, 2022, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 30, 2022. It is currently inactive. According to the archives available at the Wayback Machine, the disputed domain name previously redirected¹ to the website at the domain name <mimelon.com>, an online store offering various electronic devices of different manufacturers, including the Complainant's products. The Whois records for the domain name <mimelon.com> submitted by the Complainant, show that its registrant is the Respondent. In its pre-Complaint correspondence with the Complainant, the Respondent stated that it was also the registrant of the domain name <nothing.az>. This domain name previously redirected² to the same website at the domain name <mimelon.com>.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is identical to its NOTHING trademark, because it incorporates the trademark without any additional elements.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, was not authorised by the Complainant to register it, and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name or using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant points out that while the disputed domain name is currently inactive, it previously redirected to the website at "www.mimelon.com", owned by the Respondent, which is an online shop selling electronics

¹ See <https://web.archive.org/web/20241222195853/http://nothing.ae/>

² See <https://web.archive.org/web/20241231122202/https://nothing.az/>

and smartphones, including smartphones of the Complainant alongside products of the Complainant's competitors. According to the Complainant, the Respondent created an implied affiliation with the Complainant and tried to "corner" the market in domain names that reflect the NOTHING trademark of the Complainant by also registering the domain name <nothing.az>, which has also redirected to the Respondent's online shop at the domain name <mimelon.com>.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name - an exact match of the Complainant's NOTHING trademark - to take unfair advantage of its trademark, and used the disputed domain name to attract visitors to its own online store that sells products of the Complainant and of its competitors. In the Complainant's submission, the registration and identical use of the domain name <nothing.az> by the Respondent shows a pattern of conduct targeting the Complainant.

The Complainant notes that in the period November 2025 - January 2026, it exchanged communications with the Respondent in an attempt for amicable settlement. In the course of these communications, the Respondent requested USD 10,000 for the transfer of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent thus tried to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for a valuable consideration in excess of Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent denies that the disputed domain name has been registered or used in bad faith. It states that the disputed domain name was registered on August 30, 2022, when the Respondent was engaged in online retail activities in the United Arab Emirates. The Respondent maintains that it operates a legitimate business, sells only products sourced from lawful suppliers with official invoices, and does not offer any counterfeit goods.

The Respondent notes that "nothing" is a common dictionary word, and states that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, it was not aware of the Complainant or its trademark rights.

The Respondent confirms that the disputed domain name temporarily redirected to the domain name <mimelon.com>, and states that this was done without knowledge of the Respondent and without an intent to mislead users or to present itself as the Complainant. The Respondent points out that upon receiving notice, it immediately stopped the redirection.

The Respondent states that it is willing to resolve the dispute amicably and that any monetary discussion was related to cost recovery, not to a bad faith sale intent.

With a communication made following the submission of the Response, the Respondent notes (in relevant part):

"[...] considering that the domains have been registered and maintained for several years, there have naturally been associated costs over time. I would therefore appreciate if you could propose a fair and reasonable solution from your side so that we can conclude this matter amicably. Alternatively, I would also appreciate a small goodwill gesture, such as one of your latest products, as a positive way to conclude this matter."

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 6(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of a disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which

the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

Given the similarities between the Policy and Rules and the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”), the Panel considers the applicable sections of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”) relevant to the present matter and will refer to them where appropriate.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has proven its ownership of various valid registrations of the NOTHING trademark made before the registration of the disputed domain name, including in the United Arab Emirates. As noted in section 1.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case. This principle is not affected by the obvious fact that, as noted by the Respondent, the word “nothing” is also a dictionary word. There are many examples of dictionary words registered as trademarks in relation to goods or services unrelated to the dictionary meaning of the respective words, and it is difficult to imagine what goods or services the word “nothing” might possibly be descriptive of.

Disregarding the “.ae” country code Top-Level-Domain (“ccTLD”) as a functional aspect of the domain name system, the disputed domain name incorporates in full the NOTHING trademark without any other elements. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the NOTHING trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised 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 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 name. The Respondent has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain name is identical to the NOTHING trademark. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name, being identical to the Complainant’s trademark, together with its previous use to redirect to the domain name <mimelon.com>, which resolves to an online shop selling various electronics, creates risk of Internet user confusion.

The Respondent confirms that it is engaged in an online retail business, and that the disputed domain name previously redirected to the domain name <mimelon.com>, which resolves to an online shop selling various electronics. The Respondent does not deny that this online shop offers the Complainant's products alongside the products of its competitors. In its online communications with the Complainant, the Respondent stated that it was also the registrant of the domain name <nothing.az>, which also redirected to the same online shop.

The Respondent notes that "nothing" is a common dictionary word, but does not explain the reasons why it chose to register the disputed domain name and the domain name <nothing.az>, and the evidence in the case does not suggest that these domain names may have been registered and intended to be used in relation to the dictionary meaning of "nothing". In any case, the Respondent is offering "something" at its online shop, particularly the Complainant's NOTHING smartphones alongside other brands.

Considering the above, the Respondent's statement that it had no knowledge of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name, and that the redirection to the Respondent's online shop was made without an intent to mislead users, is unconvincing. Rather, it appears as more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, together with the domain name <nothing.az>, targeting the Complainant and its trademark in an attempt to attract business to its online electronics shop for commercial gain. Such scheme cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the test under the Policy.

C. Registered or is Being Used in Bad Faith

As already noted, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's NOTHING trademark without the addition of any other elements, and previously redirected to the domain name <mimelon.com>, which resolves to an online shop selling various electronics.

The Respondent gives no explanation why it decided to register the disputed domain name and the domain name <nothing.az> and how it intended to use them. The evidence on record shows that they have been used to redirect visitors to an online electronics shop operated by the Respondent, where the Complainant's smartphones are offered for sale alongside the smartphones of its competitors.

In view of the above, the Panel accepts as more likely than not that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name to exploit the reputation of the NOTHING trademark of the Complainant to attract visitors to its online shop by misleading them that it is affiliated to the Complainant, and has thus registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The fact that the Respondent has registered one other domain name that it also identical to the Complainant's NOTHING trademarks and has used it in an identical way, supports a finding that the Respondent has also engaged in a pattern of conduct to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its NOTHING trademark in corresponding domain names, which further supports a finding of bad faith conduct by the Respondent.

Similarly, the fact that the Respondent has requested the amount of USD 10,000 for the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant supports a conclusion that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name also for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name (absent any evidence from the Respondent to the contrary). Telling of the Respondent's bad faith is also its suggestion that it would "appreciate a small goodwill gesture, such as one of [the Complainant's] latest products" in exchange for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 6(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the domain name <nothing.ae> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Panelist

Date: April 30, 2026