

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nalli's Silks Sari Centre v. Mira Holdings

Case No. D2024-5168

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nalli's Silks Sari Centre, India, represented by VNR Associates, India.

The Respondent is Mira Holdings, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nallis.com> is registered with TurnCommerce, Inc. DBA NameBright.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 13, 2024. On December 17, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

Between December 18 and 24, 2025, the Complainant and the Center exchanged a number of emails relating to deficiencies in the Complaint. The Complainant filed an Amended Complaint on December 24, 2025.

The Center verified that 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 January 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response by the due date. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on January 27, 2025. 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 Respondent filed a late Response on January 30, 2025, together with an explanation for the late filing.

On February 6, 2025, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 (“PO1”) inviting the Complainant to comment on the admissibility of the late Response. The Complainant replied on February 8, 2025.

Thereafter the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 2 (“PO2”) and Procedural Order No. 3 (“PO3”) on February 11, and 20, 2025, respectively, inviting both parties to comment on number of matters. The Complainant responded to each order on February 15, and 24, 2025, respectively. The Respondent did not respond.

The Panel will refer below to the contents of the various procedural orders, and the Complainant’s responses thereto, insofar as the Panel considers them material to its decision.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is described in the Complaint as “a registered Proprietorship Firm”, which the Panel understands is not a separate legal entity but, effectively, a trading name of Mr. Nalli Sambbasivm. Accordingly, references to “the Complainant” below should be taken as including Mr. Nalli Sambbasivm.

Since 1981, the Complainant has manufactured and supplied clothing/textiles under the mark NALLI’S SILKS SARI CENTRE in Mumbai, India, via a retail premises of that name.

The Complainant is a member of the extended Nalli family, which has been using NALLI-formative marks in connection with the manufacture and supply of clothing/textiles since the 1920s, including via a shop called “Nalli Weaving Centre” at Kanchipuram, India from the 1960s. The family has since split into four “clans” (to use the Complainant’s term), each of which is using NALLI-related marks for separate India-based clothing/textile businesses, and who are engaged in multiple court and trade mark tribunal disputes relating to the NALLI mark. One of these clans is referred to below as “the Chetty Group.”

The Complainant owns Indian trade mark No. 606409 for NALLI’S, registered on September 10, 1993, in class 24. The Complainant explains its status as: “[r]enewal stayed due to family dispute”. According to the Intellectual Property India database, this mark expired in September 2013. The Complainant also owns New Zealand trade mark No. 607289 for NALLI’S SILKS SARI CENTRE, registered on September 6, 2001, in class 24.

The Complainant registered the disputed domain name on August 9, 1999.

On July 25, 2009, a WIPO panel ordered the Complainant to transfer of the disputed domain name to the Chetty Group. See *M/s Nalli Chinnasami Chetty v. Nalli’s Silks Sari Centre*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0664](#) (“the Prior Case”). Thereafter, the Complainant filed a declaratory proceeding (Suit No. 2309 of 2009) in the Bombay High Court. The Panel understands that that case is still pending in the Indian courts.

On November 24, 2021, another WIPO Panel dismissed a case filed by the Chetty Group against the Complainant in respect of the domain name <nalli.cloud>. See *Nalli Chinnasami Chetty v. Sambbasivm Nalli, Nalli’s SILKS SARI CENTRE*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1831](#) (“the <nalli.cloud> Case”). That decision is also the subject of court proceedings in India.

The Complainant unintentionally allowed the disputed domain name to expire on an unspecified date.

The Respondent – which describes itself as a professional domain name investor that acquires short, memorable domain names to list for sale or lease to the general public – acquired the disputed domain name in a Snapnames.com auction on October 5, 2022, for USD 1,174.

The Respondent resolved the disputed domain name to a website inviting offers to purchase the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has produced undated screenshots showing the disputed domain name being offered for sale on third party websites for USD 28,750 and INR 2,504,251.07 (which the Panel understands equates to a broadly similar price).

On December 9, 2024, the Complainant emailed the Respondent saying that it had owned the disputed domain name since 1999, that it had discovered from the website that the disputed domain name was for sale, that it would not offer the price quoted on the display page and that, in the absence of a reasonable offer, as a bona fide user of the mark for many decades the Complainant would file a domain name dispute resolution case.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's email.

The Respondent was found to have registered and used domain names in bad faith in the following cases (in 2022 and 2024 respectively): *Hangzhou Bioer Technology Co., Ltd. v. Mira Hold / Mira Holdings, Inc*, ADNDRC Case No. HK-2201614 (<bioer.com>) ("the Bioer Case") and *SRL BOWTEX v. Mira Holdings*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1632](#) (<bowtex.com>) ("the Bowtex Case").

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 Complainant is the "original proprietor" of the NALLI mark;
- the Complainant and its predecessors are "the first and prior adopters" of that mark;
- the Complainant is eligible to use the NALLI mark "by birth (inheritance)";
- the Complainant "claims exclusive right to usage of the said surname for his business";
- the Complainant originally registered the disputed domain name in a bona fide manner, with no intention of misleading anyone;
- the Complainant formerly used the disputed domain name;
- the Complainant, including its successors, has legitimate rights and interests in the disputed domain name arising from the trading activity of the family business for over 96 years;
- failure to transfer the disputed domain name, which was of immense value to the Complainant, and included the Complainant's his own name, would be highly prejudicial to the Complainant's business;
- there is no evidence that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in an honest manner or used it for a bona fide business;
- the Complainant is well known in the silk sari/textiles business and the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's long-standing use of the mark NALLI by the Complainant, in Kanchipuram as well as Mumbai;
- the Respondent "usurped" the disputed domain name during a "short interim period of non-renewal" for monetary gain and offered it for sale at an exorbitant price;
- the Respondent, which has no connection with the clothing industry, has a propensity to buy domain names when they expire and then offer to sell them back to the original owners at exorbitantly high prices;
- in many cases, the Respondent has been ordered to transfer domain names to their original owners;
- the balance of convenience favours the Complainant as the Complainant has been using the NALLI trade mark for decades in India and it is the Complainant's surname, whereas no harm would be caused to the Respondent if the Complainant retrieved the disputed domain name;

- the Indian courts have observed that all members of the Complainant's family are entitled to use the mark on the doctrine of shared goodwill; and
- the Complainant's submissions were accepted in the <nalli.cloud> Case.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends that:

- the disputed domain name is a "short, memorable 'surname'" domain name with an estimated value of more than USD 8,000, according to the GoDaddy domain appraisal tool;
- "Nallis" or "Nalli" is a surname used by more than 900 people;
- the Respondent has sold comparable surname domain names for substantial prices ranging from USD 10,000 to USD 32,500;
- based on these "strong domain values" the Respondent decided to bid for disputed domain name when it became available in auction in October 2022;
- the Respondent paid USD 1,174 for the disputed domain name based on its shortness and memorable nature and not with a view to targeting the Complainant;
- investing in domain names constitutes a bona fide offering of goods and services;
- the Respondent, located in the United States, was unaware of the Complainant until this proceeding was filed;
- the Complainant could have bid in the auction or demanded that Snapnames.com stop the auction and transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant;
- individuals and companies are using the "Nallis" name including an individual offering marketing services in France and a sporting centre in Finland;
- others are using the "Nalli" name including for an under construction page at or offering a similar domain name for sale at USD 9,399;
- the Complainant owns no live, exact match United States trade marks for NALLIS and the Respondent is not responsible for searching the world for foreign trade marks;
- the Complainant's¹ United States trade mark No. 2444608 for NALLI is non-exclusive and registered for a narrow class of goods and services;
- the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for clothing/textiles or to target the Complainant's business in any way;
- since acquisition, the Complainant resolved the disputed domain name to an enquiry page;
- the Respondent has never offered the disputed domain name for sale directly to the Complainant, and offering a generic domain name for sale in itself is not bad faith;
- the price of USD 25,000 provided by the Respondent's agent GoDaddy in response to the Complainant's enquiry via the Respondent's website was merely a starting point in negotiations and, in any case, the Respondent and others have sold comparable domain names in this price range;
- instead of undertaking due diligence regarding a fair market price, the Complainant chose to file this proceeding rather than paying a price it deemed too high, which is evidence of reverse domain name hijacking ("RDNH"); and
- the Complainant² has been found guilty of RDNH in three previous cases: *Nalli Chinnasami Chetty v. Anthony Nalli, FourPoints Multimedia Corp*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2642](#) (<nalligroup.com>), *Nalli Chinnasami Chetty v. Matt Nall*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3283](#) (<nallindustries.com>)³, and *Nalli Chinnasami Chetty v. Jennifer Nalli*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3556](#) (<nallifinancialservices.com>).

¹ In fact, this trade mark is owned by the Chetty Group, not the Complainant.

² Again, the Respondent has confused the Complainant with the Chetty Group, which is the complainant in all these three cases. See further below.

³ The Panel notes that there is no finding of RDNH in this case.

6. Discussion and Findings

Late Response – Preliminary Issue

The Response, which was due on January 22, 2025, was in fact received by the Center on January 30, 2025.

The explanation by the Respondent is that the Center's emails were found in its spam folder, that the courier delivery of the Complaint was signed for by a third-party and not received/reviewed by the Respondent until January 28, 2025, and that the Registrar did not notify the Complainant by email.

The Complainant objects to admissibility of the Response, including on the grounds that the Respondent has not provided any evidence in support of its explanation.

Paragraph 10(c) of the Rules requires the Panel to ensure that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition, adding that the Panel may extend a period of time fixed by the Rules "in exceptional cases".

Paragraph 10(d) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall consider the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence.

While the delay in filing the Response is not insignificant, and the Respondent ought to have provided evidence supporting its request for admission of the Response, the Panel had nonetheless decided on balance to admit the late Response on the grounds that it sets out in detail the Respondent's alleged motive for its registration and use of the disputed domain name, which the Panel wishes to consider. Furthermore, the Panel does not consider that admitting the late Response unfairly prejudices the Complainant.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy based on the Complainant's New Zealand trade mark No. 607289. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The dominant part of the trade mark, "NALLI'S", is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

It is unnecessary for the Panel to consider this element in light of the Panel's conclusions under the third element below.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The gist of the Complainant's case is that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's longstanding and well-known mark and that the Respondent "usurped" the disputed domain name following its unintended expiry in order to sell it to the Complainant for an exorbitant price, having been found to have acted in a similar manner in relation to other domain names.

For its part, the Respondent denies that it was aware of the Complainant, claiming that it chose to bid for the disputed domain name in an expiring domain name auction because it was a short and memorable surname

domain name, and invoking the Respondent's previous sale of a number of other surname domain names for "strong" prices ranging from USD 10,000 to USD 32,500.

The Panel will first consider whether the Respondent was likely to have been aware of the Complainant's mark based on its alleged reputation.

While, the Complainant has indeed demonstrated, including by means of official certificates, invoices and utility bills, that it operated a retail premises called "Nalli's Silks Sari Centre" in Mumbai since 1981, the Complainant has not provided evidence supporting its claim to have thereby generated substantial goodwill and reputation in its name, or the NALLI mark, internationally. In particular, the Complainant has not provided any evidence that speaks to the scale of its business, such as turnover figures or marketing spend/examples.

Indeed, and as further discussed below, the Complainant has produced no evidence whatever of a historical or current online presence for its business.

Furthermore, the Complainant has acknowledged that it is one of four India-based clans, including the Chetty Group, each of which is using NALLI-formative marks in connection with the manufacture and/or supply of clothing. Although all derived from the same family business, the clans now apparently operate separate enterprises which are in dispute with each other regarding the NALLI mark.

This family contention extends to the disputed domain name itself. In the Prior Case (2009), a WIPO panel ordered the Complainant, the original owner of the disputed domain name, to transfer the disputed domain name to the Chetty Group. The gist of this decision was that, despite the claim of the Complainant (i.e., the respondent in that proceeding) to 28 years' legitimate use of the NALLI mark (i.e., since 1981), the Complainant had nonetheless registered and used the disputed domain name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Chetty Group's even earlier rights in the NALLI mark. That transfer was never implemented owing to still-pending court proceedings in India and, at some point thereafter, the Complainant unintentionally allowed the disputed domain name to expire, following which the Respondent acquired it – giving rise to the present case.

While the parties to, and circumstances of, the Prior Case were different to those here, this decision at least reinforces the fact that the Complainant is by no means the exclusive user of the NALLI mark for clothing and, indeed, that it may not even be the senior user. The Panel would add that the Complainant has failed to support its assertion that it inherited common law rights in the mark NALLI from family predecessors arising from their use since the 1920s, i.e., in addition to the Complainant's own use of the mark since 1981.

Accordingly, the Complainant has fallen well short of establishing that the Respondent was likely to have been aware of the Complainant's mark purely on the basis of its alleged fame.

Nor does the Panel consider that the level of price that the Respondent sought for the disputed domain name of itself indicates an intent to target the Complainant. While the circumstances and exact amount of the Respondent's offer are not entirely clear – the Complainant refers to the disputed domain name being listed for sale at for USD 28,750 whereas the Respondent refers to a GoDaddy offer of USD 25,000 in response to a Complainant enquiry (not mentioned by the Complainant) – either way the price is in line with the other domain names sold by the Respondent. The Panel would add that there is no suggestion that the Respondent at any point made an unsolicited offer to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

The Panel will next consider the two adverse UDRP decisions against the Respondent that were invoked by the Complainant – the Bioer Case and the Bowtex Case.

The Panel considers that the significance of these decisions as a factor weighing against the Respondent depends on the extent to which the disputed domain name forms part of a similar pattern of conduct.

The Panel notes that the Complainant does not discuss either case in any detail, let alone attempt to establish such a pattern.

The Panel further notes that, unlike here, the domain names at issue in those cases reflected highly distinctive made-up words and that the respective complainants had each demonstrated a reputation in the sense that their marks featured prominently in Google searches for the relevant terms, whereas there is no such evidence in this case (as further discussed below).

In the Bowtex Case, the panel set out the principles that it considered applicable where a registrant acquired a domain name in an expiring domain name auction. There, as here, the Respondent had claimed that it acquired the domain name without reference to, or awareness of, the complainant's trade mark. The panel found that:

- as a general rule, a person such as the Respondent had the right to acquire a domain name containing a dictionary word or phrase based upon its dictionary meaning and to offer this for sale at a price of its choosing, provided that in so doing it did not target the trade mark value of the term;
- however, given that the domain name had the appearance of a trade mark or coined word rather than a dictionary term, and which it knew to have a history, the Respondent, as a domain name investor, should have shown a basic level of due diligence when acquiring it in a drop catching auction;
- the Respondent need have looked no further than a brief trade mark search in its own jurisdiction, and/or a basic search of the history of the disputed domain name, and/or a Google search for the trade mark owner's official website;
- the Respondent either knew about the complainant's trade mark in the Respondent's jurisdiction (i.e., United States) or deliberately looked the other way in an act of wilful blindness;
- the Respondent was on notice that the domain name had a history but appeared not to have researched it, whereas an Internet Archive search would have shown that it was in use by the complainant around 16 months before the Respondent registered it;
- while there was no hard evidence in support of the complainant's submission that its mark was well known, its website appeared at the top of a current Google search;
- any one of those searches would probably have disclosed the complainant's interest; and
- it was implausible that the Respondent performed no such investigations but, if it did not, it should have done so and its wilful blindness to the complainant's rights did not absolve it from the consequences of the Policy.

Applying those principles to the disputed domain name, is it likely that the Respondent thought that the disputed domain name derived from a trade mark, rather than purely a surname, when it opted to bid for the disputed domain name in the expiring domain names auction?

The Respondent claims that more than 900 people worldwide use "Nalli" or "Nallis" as a surname. However, not only has the Respondent bundled the surnames "Nallis" and "Nalli" together without explanation but, in any case, the alleged total number for both hardly qualifies either name as a common surname. In fact, the Respondent's supporting screenshot makes no mention of "Nalli" and appears only to specify that 98 people bear the surname "Nallis".

In addition, despite the panel's rejection of such evidence in the Bowtex case, the Respondent has produced a retrospective Internet trawl for people/businesses using the names "Nalli" and "Nallis" rather than focussing on exactly what it thought at the time of purchase. Again, the Respondent has lumped the two names together without explanation; only two of the examples relate to "Nallis" and one of these, a "ballparking centre" in Finland, is clearly not using the name "Nallis" at all. That just leaves just one "Nallis" example – an individual with the surname "Nallis" offering marketing services in France.

Accordingly, albeit that it has demonstrated a track record of selling surname-type domain names for significant sums, the Panel does not find the Respondent's evidence in support of its claim that it selected the disputed domain name as a surname domain name to be particularly convincing.

However, without reaching a conclusion on the point, the Panel will instead (a) assume for the purpose of argument that the Respondent did think that the disputed domain name might reflect someone's trade mark and (b) consider whether, if so, a basic level of due diligence by the Respondent of the kind mooted in the Bowtex Case would likely have disclosed the Complainant's interest.

First, while the Complainant refers to a “short interim period of non-renewal”, the Complainant has not specified the date when the disputed domain name expired, let alone provided any supporting evidence. Accordingly, it is by no means certain that the Complainant was the registrant of the disputed domain name immediately prior to the Respondent.

Second, the Complainant has provided no historical screenshots showing its alleged former use of the disputed domain name.

In accordance with its entitlement to undertake limited factual research, including consulting historical resources such as the Internet Archive (“www.archive.org”) in order to obtain an indication of how a domain name may have been used in the relevant past (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8), the Panel has reviewed the Internet Archive records for the disputed domain name. The most recent active website operated by the Complainant that the Panel was able to find,⁴ branded NALLI’S, was dated as long ago as February 18, 2012, i.e., some 10 years before the Respondent’s acquisition of the disputed domain name, whereas the last available archive version of the complainant’s website in the Bowtex Case preceded the relevant domain name by only 16 months.

Third, the Complainant has provided no Google or other Internet searches showing that the Complainant’s business had achieved any particular Internet rankings either currently or at the time of the Respondent’s acquisition in 2022. Indeed, when the Panel attempted to visit “www.nalli.cloud”, which the Complainant said it had registered “to promote its business across the world”, this domain name simply resolved to a Registrar holding page. By contrast, in the Bowtex Case, the website of the complainant appeared at the top of a current Google search.

Fourth, the Complainant has provided no evidence that it owns a trade mark in the Respondent’s jurisdiction, i.e., in the United States. While the Respondent refers to a United States trade mark, this is in fact owned by the Chetty Group, not the Complainant.

For all of these reasons, even if the Respondent was, or had reason to be, suspicious of the disputed domain name, and even if the Respondent had carried out the basic due diligence suggested in the Bowtex Case, or should have done (and the Panel expresses no opinion either way as to the applicability of wilful blindness in such a scenario), the Complainant has provided no evidence whatever indicating that the Complainant’s interest would likely have come to light.

And even if the Respondent had become aware of the existence of the use of a NALLI or NALLI’S mark for clothing in India, it would probably have found itself in a confusing landscape, illustrated by the fact that, notwithstanding the Complainant’s explanations of its family history in the Complaint, the Respondent in its Response still managed to misattribute a United States trade mark and three UDRP cases (involving findings of RDNH) to the Complainant instead of the Chetty Group.

For the above reasons, the Panel considers that there are material differences between facts of this case, and those in the Bioer Case and the Bowtex Case, such that they are not strong indicators of bad faith in this proceeding.

Finally, the Panel does not consider that the following additional points raised by the Complainant assist it for the reasons set out below.

That the balance of convenience favours the Complainant as the Complainant has been using the NALLI trade mark for decades in India and it is the Complainant’s surname, whereas no harm would be caused to the Respondent if the Complainant retrieved the disputed domain name. The Panel is concerned only with whether or not the Complainant has established the three elements under the Policy and not with the general

⁴ The Panel considered whether to put this screenshot to the Complainant for comment but decided against. First, having repeatedly cited the Bowtex Case, the Complainant was, or should have been, well aware of (a) the existence of the Internet Archive and (b) the potential importance of demonstrating its use of the website as recently as possible before expiry of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, if it transpires that the Panel is wrong and that the Complainant used the disputed domain name for a website far closer to its expiry date, that would not assist the Complainant, given its failure to provide evidence of same with its Complaint.

application of the “balance of convenience” or other such factors that a court may take into account when considering whether to grant an injunction.

That the Indian courts have observed that all members of the Complainant’s family are entitled to use the mark on the doctrine of shared goodwill. Again it is difficult to see how any such findings are relevant to the matters for consideration by the Panel, at the very least in the absence of any clear evidence that the various clans were somehow entitled to act en bloc and that the Complainant was authorised to act for all.

That the Complainant’s submissions were accepted in the <nalli.cloud> Case. That decision involved an entirely different scenario as the complainant was the Chetty Group and the panel decided that the case raised commercial and/or family issues that were not suited for resolution under the Policy.

For the above reasons, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

D. 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 or was brought primarily 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”. RDNH is defined under the Rules as “using the UDRP in bad faith to attempt to deprive a registered domain-name holder of a domain name”. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

The reasons articulated by panels for finding RDNH, as set out in section 4.16 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), include the following, which the Respondent relies upon: filing the complaint after an unsuccessful attempt to acquire the disputed domain name from the respondent without a plausible legal basis.

The Panel declines to make a finding of RDNH in this case.

First, the Panel has not been provided with clear, dated evidence regarding the Respondent’s intent and/or process of acquiring the disputed domain name.

Second, while the Complaint was weak, the Panel does not consider that it lacked a plausible legal basis, not least in light of the two previous UDRP cases where the Respondent was found to have registered and used domain names in bad faith, and neither of which the Respondent saw fit to comment upon in its Response.

Third, as mentioned above, the three UDRP cases cited by the Respondent as involving RDNH findings against the Complainant, in fact related to the Chetty Group and not the Complainant.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: March 10, 2025