

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Figma, Inc. v. Pietro Schirano

Case No. DAI2026-0017

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Figma, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Pietro Schirano, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <figma.ai> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 6, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 9, 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 (NewCompute, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 10, 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 March 13, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 March 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 10, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on April 10, 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, Figma, Inc., is a Delaware corporation founded in October 2012 and headquartered in San Francisco, California, United States. The Complainant operates a leading collaborative web-based design platform used for designing, prototyping, and building digital applications and products. On July 31, 2025, the Complainant completed an initial public offering and listed on the New York Stock Exchange under the ticker symbol FIG. As of the third quarter of 2025, the Complainant employs over 1,800 people and has exceeded USD 1 billion in annual revenue. The Complainant maintains offices across multiple continents and operates its primary website from the domain name <figma.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registered trademarks for the term FIGMA in jurisdictions worldwide. Representative FIGMA registrations include:

- United Kingdom Registration No. UK00913681721, registered June 24, 2015, in Class 9;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 013681721, registered June 24, 2015, in Class 9; and
- United States Registration No. 5110233, registered December 27, 2016, in Class 9.

The earliest of these marks carries a priority date of August 1, 2014. The FIGMA mark is a coined, fanciful term with no recognized meaning in English or any other language.

The Respondent operates under the trade name MagicPath. The Respondent operates an artificial intelligence-assisted design tool at the domain name <magicpath.ai> that generates layouts and design directions. The Respondent's product is directed at the same user community as the Complainant's platform, and the Respondent's own website and YouTube channel make extensive reference to the Complainant's Figma application, including a dedicated integration page explaining how to connect MagicPath to the Complainant's Figma application.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 23, 2020. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name was configured to redirect Internet users directly to the Respondent's commercial website at the domain name <magicpath.ai>. The DNS zone file for the disputed domain name also included Mail Exchanger ("MX") and Sender Policy Framework ("SPF") records, indicating that the domain name was capable of outbound email communication.

On January 27, 2026, the Complainant's representative contacted the Respondent and offered USD 500 to cover registration and renewal costs in exchange for the Respondent's voluntary transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent declined, stating that it would remove the redirect to its website but would not sell the disputed domain name for less than USD 5 million.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its registered FIGMA trademark, which is a coined and fanciful term with no meaning in English or any other language, and that the generic top-level domain “.ai” is disregarded for purposes of comparison under the Policy.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the name FIGMA, has never traded legitimately under that name, owns no trademark rights in the term, and has received no license, permission, or authorization from the Complainant to use its mark. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a competing commercial website cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant’s well-known FIGMA mark, as demonstrated by the Respondent’s own website and YouTube channel, which make extensive and repeated reference to the Complainant’s platform and include a dedicated page explaining how to integrate the Respondent’s competing service with the Complainant’s application. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has exploited the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users seeking the Complainant to the Respondent’s competing commercial website at the domain name <magicpath.ai>, constituting intentional attraction for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Complainant additionally contends that the configuration of the disputed domain name with MX and SPF records creates the potential for misleading email communications impersonating the Complainant. The Complainant further contends that when approached by the Complainant’s representative and offered USD 500 to cover registration and renewal costs, the Respondent countered with a demand of no less than USD 5 million, a sum grossly disproportionate to any legitimate out-of-pocket costs and reflective of an opportunistic intent inconsistent with legitimate domain name ownership.

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 name.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s FIGMA mark in its entirety. The addition of the country-code top-level domain “.ai” does not prevent a finding of identity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It is well accepted that proving a negative is often an impossible task, and

accordingly, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating such rights or interests. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case. The record discloses no basis on which the Respondent could claim rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name Figma, has never traded legitimately under that name, and owns no trademark or service mark rights in the term. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has received no permission, authorization, or acquiescence from the Complainant to use the FIGMA mark in connection with any domain name, product, or service.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to its own competing commercial website at the domain name <magicpath.ai> does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Panels have consistently held that use of a complainant's mark to redirect users to a competing site cannot support a claim to rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3. The Respondent's website and YouTube channel make extensive and repeated reference to the Complainant's Figma application, including a dedicated integration page, and the Respondent's own product is directed at the same user community as the Complainant's platform. An Internet user arriving at the disputed domain name would reasonably expect to find content associated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by the Complainant. The exploitation of that identity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark to drive traffic to a competing commercial service cannot confer legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Nor does the Respondent's use constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's coined FIGMA mark and the redirect is to a commercial enterprise operated by the Respondent for profit. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. The Panel may also consider any other circumstances it finds relevant to the inquiry. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.

The FIGMA mark is a coined, fanciful term with no meaning in English or any other language, and Internet searches for the term return results exclusively associated with the Complainant and its products. Panels have consistently held that registration of a domain name identical to a well-known coined mark raises a presumption of bad faith, as there is no plausible innocent explanation for such a registration. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. That presumption is particularly strong here. The Respondent operates MagicPath, an artificial intelligence-assisted design tool competing directly with the Complainant's platform and expressly marketed to the same user community.

The Respondent's own website dedicates a page to integrating MagicPath with the Complainant's application, and the Respondent's YouTube channel features no fewer than fifteen videos referencing the Complainant's Figma application by name. The Respondent therefore had actual, demonstrable knowledge of the Complainant and its FIGMA mark at the time of registration. The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent registered a domain name identical to the Complainant's well-known coined mark without awareness of that mark and without intent to exploit it. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Respondent's selection of the ".ai" top-level domain further reinforces this conclusion, as ".ai" has acquired widespread recognition as an abbreviation for artificial intelligence, a field central to both the Complainant's and the Respondent's businesses. The choice of this particular top-level domain in combination with the Complainant's exact mark was not coincidental.

The disputed domain name was configured to redirect Internet users directly to the Respondent's competing commercial website at the domain name <magicpath.ai>. This constitutes intentional use of the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent benefits commercially from such misdirected traffic. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name's DNS zone file was configured with MX and SPF records, enabling it to be used for outbound email communication. A domain name identical to the Complainant's well-known mark, configured for email, creates a significant risk that recipients of communications sent from that domain would believe they were dealing with the Complainant. Previous panels have recognized that the configuration of MX records, particularly where the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation, constitutes an ongoing threat to the Complainant as it is capable of misleading Internet users. See *Klarna Bank AB v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Melanie Forster*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0756](#).

The Panel also considers the Respondent's response to the Complainant's outreach. When the Complainant's representative contacted the Respondent in January 2026 and offered USD 500 to cover the domain name's registration and renewal costs, the Respondent countered with a demand of at least USD 5 million. The Panel acknowledges that the Respondent's counteroffer was not unsolicited, and that an unsolicited offer to sell may make the case fall under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. Nevertheless, panels have recognized that a grossly excessive counteroffer made in response to a complainant's good-faith outreach, particularly where the respondent was demonstrably aware of the complainant's rights at the time of registration, is relevant evidence of bad faith under the totality of circumstances. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.

Considered individually or in the aggregate, the circumstances of this case, including the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant's mark at the time of registration, the registration of a domain name identical to a coined mark with no plausible innocent purpose, the deliberate redirect to a competing commercial website, the email-capable configuration of the disputed domain name, and the grossly excessive counteroffer, establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

The Panel 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 name <figma.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2026