

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

VSSB Zrt. v. Muhammad Hassan Iqbal  
Case No. DAI2026-0003

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is VSSB Zrt., Hungary, represented by Oppenheim Ügyvédi Iroda (Oppenheim Law Firm), Hungary.

The Respondent is Muhammad Hassan Iqbal, Pakistan, self-represented.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

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

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 22, 2026. On January 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 26, 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 January 26, 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 amendment to the Complaint on January 28, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 January 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 19, 2026. On February 1, 2026, the Center received an email communication from the Respondent. The Response was filed with the Center on February 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 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 Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing on March 9, 2026.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is in the business of providing shared business, technology, and operational services within the telecommunications sector, including AI-driven digital transformation, automation, customer care, and corporate support services. It owns the trademark VOIS, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration in various jurisdictions, including Hungary Trademark Registration No. 248828, filed on June 13, 2025, and registered on January 14, 2026. The Complainant also owns International Trademark Registration No. 1570127 for VOIS, registered on July 30, 2020.

The disputed domain name was originally registered on December 9, 2023. The Respondent asserts that it acquired the disputed domain name through a registrar auction on December 14, 2025.

The disputed domain name does not appear to have been actively used in connection with a developed website. At various times the disputed domain name has been listed for sale.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

In particular, the Complainant argues that the Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name cannot reasonably be explained by coincidence given that it consists solely of the Complainant's VOIS mark. The Complainant submits that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when acquiring the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the choice of the ".ai" Top-Level Domain supports a finding of targeting because the Complainant provides artificial intelligence-driven services.

The Complainant also argues that bad faith is demonstrated by the fact that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale.

In a Supplemental Filing, the Complainant further contends that the chronology relating to the pricing and acquisition of the disputed domain name by the Respondent raises questions regarding the Respondent's intentions. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name had been listed for sale for approximately USD 15,000 for an extended period before its asking price was increased to nearly USD 100,000 in early December 2025. Later that month, however, the disputed domain name was allegedly transferred to the Respondent through a registrar auction for approximately USD 860.

The Complainant argues that these circumstances are inconsistent with a typical aftermarket purchase by an independent developer and suggests an attempt to distance the disputed domain name from its earlier sales history in anticipation of a UDRP proceeding.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent contends that it acquired the disputed domain name through a registrar auction in connection with plans to develop artificial intelligence technologies. It asserts that it selected the disputed domain name because it is suitable as an acronym for "voice intelligence systems" and/or as a conjunction of

the terms “voice” plus “intelligence”, and that “VOIS” is a short, four-letter combination capable of multiple meanings and acronymic interpretation.

The Respondent further states that it has not configured the disputed domain name for any commercial, competitive, or misleading purpose and has not attempted to impersonate the Complainant or otherwise target the Complainant’s business.

The Respondent asserts that it was not aware of the Complainant or its trademark when it acquired the disputed domain name. The Respondent also notes that it has not contacted the Complainant regarding the disputed domain name and has not engaged in a pattern of registering domain names corresponding to the trademarks of others.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (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 and is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Preliminary Issue: The Complainant’s Supplemental Filing**

The Complainant submitted an unsolicited Supplemental Filing addressing, among other things, the Respondent’s assertions regarding the acquisition of the disputed domain name through a registrar auction and the chronology surrounding the pricing and transfer of the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 10 of the Rules grants the Panel discretion to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality, and weight of the evidence. Panels generally accept supplemental filings only where they address matters that could not reasonably have been anticipated at the time of the original submission.

In the present case, the Panel considers that the Complainant’s Supplemental Filing responds to issues raised in the Response concerning the circumstances of the Respondent’s acquisition of the disputed domain name that would not have been known to the Complainant when preparing the Complaint. The Panel therefore accepts the supplemental filing and has taken it into account in reaching its decision.

### **B. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the VOIS mark through its trademark registrations.

The disputed domain name incorporates the VOIS mark in its entirety. It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant’s trademark to disregard the Top-Level Domain. Accordingly, the “.ai” Top-Level Domain is not taken into account for purposes of the confusing similarity analysis.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s VOIS mark.

The Complainant has established the first element of the Policy.

### **C. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Given the Panel’s conclusion below regarding the third element of the Policy, the Panel considers it unnecessary to reach a determination regarding the second element.

#### **D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's VOIS mark when acquiring the disputed domain name and that the Respondent's selection of the ".ai" Top-Level Domain demonstrates targeting of the Complainant's artificial intelligence-related services.

On the present record, however, the Panel does not find sufficient evidence that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant or its trademark.

The Panel accepts that the Complainant's VOIS mark enjoys strength within the Complainant's business context. At the same time, the Panel notes that the term "VOIS" is not used exclusively by the Complainant and appears in a variety of other contexts. For example, the Panel's limited investigation reveals<sup>1</sup> that the acronym "VOIS" has been used in other technical or descriptive contexts, including as a reference to a voice-activated self-monitoring device in the medical field. The United States of America Department of State also uses the acronym VOIS for its Visa Opinion Information Service. The mark VOIS is used by other businesses in the marketplace and is indeed the subject of various trademark registrations by multiple third party entities in various jurisdictions. In addition, the term is a dictionary word inasmuch as it corresponds to a conjugation of the French verb "voir".

In light of these circumstances, the Panel is not persuaded that the Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name necessarily points to the Complainant.

The Panel has also considered the Complainant's argument that the use of the ".ai" Top-Level Domain increases the inference of targeting because the Complainant offers artificial intelligence-related services. The Panel does not find this argument decisive. The use of artificial intelligence technologies has become widespread across numerous industries, and the selection of the ".ai" extension does not in itself demonstrate that the Respondent had the Complainant specifically in mind.

The Panel further acknowledges the Complainant's argument concerning the chronology of the pricing and alleged auction acquisition of the disputed domain name. While the circumstances identified by the Complainant may appear unusual and may warrant scrutiny, the Panel does not consider that these facts establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent registered or acquired the disputed domain name with the Complainant in mind.

Moreover, the disputed domain name has not been used to impersonate the Complainant, offer competing services, or otherwise clearly trade off of or falsely suggest affiliation with the Complainant or its mark.

Taking the totality of the evidence into account, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not established that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has failed to establish the third element of the Policy.

#### **E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

The Respondent has requested a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

Under paragraph 15(e) of the Rules, Reverse Domain Name Hijacking may be found where a complainant has used the UDRP in bad faith to attempt to deprive a registered domain name holder of a domain name.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

While the Panel has concluded that the Complainant has failed to establish bad faith under the Policy, the Panel does not find that the Complaint was brought in bad faith or constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The Complainant holds trademark rights in the VOIS mark and raised arguments that, while ultimately unsuccessful, were not unreasonable in the circumstances.

Accordingly, the Panel declines to make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Evan D. Brown/*

**Evan D. Brown**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2026