

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Open Society Institute v. Dena Beasley, Dena Pitre
Case No. DIO2026-0016

1. The Parties

Complainant is Open Society Institute, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Morrison & Foerster, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Dena Beasley, Dena Pitre, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <opensocietyfoundations.io> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 4, 2026. On April 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 8, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (“DENA PITRE”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to Complainant on April 10, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 11, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 3, 2026. Respondent sent an email to the Center on April 15, 2026. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on May 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on May 18, 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.

On May 18, 2026, the Panel issued a Procedural Order asking the Complainant to amend its Complaint with regard to the Mutual Jurisdiction clause, in accordance with paragraph 3(b)(xii) of the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “.IO Rules”). On May 20, 2026, the Complainant submitted an amended Complaint.

4. Factual Background

Complainant alleges as follows:

“Complainant is a philanthropic organization that works to build vibrant and tolerant societies whose governments are accountable and open to the participation of all people. Complainant funds a range of programs around the world, from public health to education to business development. It conducts a number of philanthropic services, promotes awareness and fosters the development of a civil society, and provides a database for the exchange of related information, among other services, under its OPEN SOCIETY marks, including OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATIONS, OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE, and OPEN SOCIETY POLICY CENTER. Since at least as early as April 6, 2010, Complainant has operated a website at www.opensocietyfoundations.org to promote its mission.”

Complainant holds several registered trademarks, including United States Reg. No. 4248358 for OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATIONS, registered on November 27, 2012, in connection with, among other things, “downloadable publications,” “printer publications,” and “philanthropic services,” with an August 23, 2010 date of first use in commerce.

Complainant’s founder is billionaire George Soros.

The Domain Name was registered on March 25, 2026. The Domain Name currently resolves to an error page. For a time, however, the Domain Name resolved to a website displaying the mark OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATIONS and also the text “George Soros Foundation.” The website contained a page entitled “Beneficiary Eligibility Verification” with some apparent links for Internet users to click and pursue.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions. By an April 15, 2026 email to the Center, Respondent stated: “What is this about” (no question mark or other punctuation).

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that Complainant has rights in the trademark OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATIONS through registration and use demonstrated in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Name is identical to that mark.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Respondent has not come forward to articulate any bona fide basis for registering the Domain Name, and has not disputed the allegations and evidence presented by Complainant. The undisputed record here indicates that Respondent has used the Domain Name in connection with a website impersonating Complainant. The fact that the website referred to Complainant's founder, George Soros, makes this finding obvious. It also appears that Respondent was seeking to fraudulently obtain information about website visitors who believe themselves to be or seek to be beneficiaries of Complainant's philanthropic undertakings. Such conduct plainly does not vest Respondent with a right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation," are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in "bad faith":

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion

with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel concludes, on the record provided here, that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the "Rights or Legitimate Interests" section. The undisputed record supports the conclusion that Respondent targeted Complainant's mark for purposes of impersonating Complainant via a fake commercial website, in clear violation of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 Domain Name <opensocietyfoundations.io> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: May 29, 2026