

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Inspirus, LLC v. TjR Solution, Advortex Solutions  
Case No. D2025-0311

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Inspirus, LLC, United States of America (“US”), represented by Areopage, France.

The Respondent is TjR Solution, Advortex Solutions, India.

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

The disputed domain name <inspirus.store> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 27, 2025. On January 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 27, 2025, 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 (Domains By Proxy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 28, 2025, 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 January 28, 2025.

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 January 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Hong Yang as the sole panelist in this matter on February 24, 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.

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

Founded in 1893, the Complainant is a US service provider in rewards, recognition and employee engagement. It provides incentive programs to over 350 international companies, from “Fortune 500” to new economy companies. It has regularly received various awards given by different industry organizations.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of trademarks containing the wording “Inspirus”, including the following: US Registration No. 3805248 for INSPIRUS, registered on June 22, 2010, and US Registration No. 3805249 for INSPIRUS (word in blue stylized font), registered on June 22, 2010.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet its official website “www.inspirus.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 14, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a page displaying “Inspirus” with a log in tab and indicating “Pardon our dust! We’re working on something amazing — check back soon!”.

#### **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.

##### **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. 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 trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The applicable generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), “.store” in the disputed domain name does not change this finding, since the gTLD, as a standard registration requirement, is generally disregarded under the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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

##### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized 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 3.0](#), 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 rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and 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 available record shows that the Respondent is not affiliated or otherwise authorized by the Complainant or held any registration of the INSPIRUS mark anywhere. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent may be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a page under construction, showing that the Respondent did not make any use of or have made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, neither did the Respondent make any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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

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

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used without any license or authorization the Complainant’s trademark alone and in full in the disputed domain name. The Complainant’s trademark INSPIRUS is known and the Complainant’s registration and use of its mark predates the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name by years and the disputed domain name is nearly identical to the Complainant’s domain name <inspirus.com>, so it is more likely than not that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant’s mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Respondent has not submitted any response or provided any credible explanation for the reason to register the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a page displaying “Inspirus” with a log in tab and indicating “Pardon our dust! We’re working on something amazing — check back soon!”. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent’s failure to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under 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 <inspirus.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Hong Yang/*

**Hong Yang**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2025