

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LEDGER SAS v. Kristopher Radam, hristo tsenov
Case No. D2025-0561

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LEDGER SAS, France, represented by Tmark Conseils, France.

The Respondents are Kristopher Radam, Philippines, and hristo tsenov, Bulgaria.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <ledgermarketsapp.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC. The disputed domain name <ledger966.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (collectively, the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 12, 2025. On February 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 13 and 14, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center verification responses confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2025. One of the Respondents sent an email communication to the Center on February 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on March 17, 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

The Complainant is a French simplified joint-stock company registered in the Commercial Register of Paris, France, since January 31, 2011. According to the Complaint, the Complainant operates in the cryptocurrency, blockchain and NFT industries, offering hardware and software solutions, enabling companies to purchase, store, exchange and manage their digital assets.

The Complainant asserts that it was one of the first companies to offer secure hardware wallets for cryptocurrencies, and has positioned itself as a market leader, benefiting from an international reputation, and a large community of users. It also asserts that its trademarks are well-known, and produces a Google Search for the term “ledger” in which it, and its products, are referenced in all of the top ten items. The Panel has repeated this search in the United Kingdom (where the websites associated with the disputed domain names are stated to be based) in order to ensure that the search results were not geographically specific to France, and has found the search results to be the same. The Complainant operates via the domain name <ledger.com>. This domain name was originally registered on September 19, 1994, long before the Complainant’s incorporation, and the Panel assumes that it must have acquired it at a later date.

The Complainant is the owner of a wide variety of LEDGER registered trademarks in various jurisdictions. For example, the Complainant is the owner of French Registered Trademark Number 4105615 in respect of the word mark LEDGER, filed on July 15, 2014, and registered (“Enregistrement avec modification”) on May 15, 2015, in Classes 35, 36, and 38.

The Complainant is also the owner of French Registered Trademark Number 4885904 in respect of the figurative trademark LEDGER MARKET, consisting of the first word in a stylized typeface surrounded by four right-angled corners, and the second word in a different stylized typeface, all in the color black, filed on July 20, 2022, and registered (“Enregistrement avec modification”) on December 16, 2022, in Classes 9, 35, 36, 38, and 42.

The Complainant produces European Union Intellectual Property Office Decision on Cancellation, number C 54 596, dated May 16, 2024, which mentions the following evidence that the Complainant submitted in seeking an application for a declaration of invalidity in respect of a European Union registered trademark with which the present proceeding is not directly concerned: (1) Extracts from the Complainant’s website showing products offered for sale under the LEDGER trademark; (2) French press releases and articles referring to the Complainant’s LEDGER trademark including (i) an article published on the website “www.bitcoin.fr” dating from May 2018 which mentions the Complainant’s “growing reputation”, (ii) an article published on the website “www.francebleu.fr” dating from October 2018 in which the Complainant is described as a world leader in the field of cryptocurrencies, due to its secure applications, (iii) articles in the magazine “L’Express” and on the corresponding website dating from December 2020, describing the Complainant as “the French star of the cryptocurrency world”, which has “succeeded in making its digital wallet a global reference”, with thousands of manufactured wallets sent to more than 150 countries, and sales of over 2.3 million digital wallets, “making it the world leader in the sector”, (iv) an article in the magazine “L’Express” dating from June 2021 in which the Complainant is described as having just raised USD 380 million, (v) an article published on a website entitled “Les Echos” dating from June 2021, which describes the Complainant as “the new French cryptocurrency unicorn” and “a global heavyweight in the cryptocurrency ecosystem”, (vi) an article published on a website entitled “Le Parisien” dating from June 2021, describing the Complainant’s fundraising as the second largest in FrenchTech history, adding that the Complainant is valued at EUR 1.2 billion, and (vii) a compilation of press articles dating from between 2019 and 2021 in both English and French language media referring to the Complainant’s fundraising announcements; and (3) extracts dated May 2022 of the Complainant’s social media pages showing that the Complainant has garnered 50,000 “likes” on “Facebook”, 95,000 followers on “Instagram”, and 335,000 followers on “Twitter” (now “X”).

On the strength of this, and certain other evidence, the said Decision considered it to be confirmed that the Complainant’s LEDGER trademark had a reputation before August 14, 2020, and noted that besides the evidence referring to cryptocurrency wallets and safes, the Complainant’s application “Ledger Live”, being a desktop and mobile crypto management app had more than 1.5 million monthly users before June 2021. Although the Panel has not directly reviewed the evidence concerned, it is content to adopt the finding of the

said Decision regarding the extent of the Complainant's reputation, which has also not been directly challenged by the Respondents.

The disputed domain name <ledger966.com> was registered on August 2, 2022. The disputed domain name <ledgermarketsapp.com> was registered on September 11, 2024. The disputed domain names point to websites that are almost identical, both graphically and textually, which appear to advertise an "Ai Signals Indicator", and "Professional trading tool", available in both web and mobile versions. The sites feature a "download" button (<ledger966.com>) or a "GET IT ON Google Play" button (<ledgermarketsapp.com>). Both sites use an identical logo and favicon, being a capital letter "R" in black with a green triangle completing the top leftmost part. The websites have different contact addresses at the foot of the page, namely an address in Eastbourne, United Kingdom (<ledger966.com>) and an address in London, United Kingdom (<ledgermarketsapp.com>).

The website associated with the disputed domain name <ledger966.com> has three additional links not present on the website associated with the disputed domain name <ledgermarketsapp.com>, although the frame at the top of the page in which these appear is common to both websites. The links are: "About Us", "Contact Us", and "Our Team". Clicking on each of these links produces an overlaid page on top of the home page of the said website. Each of these overlaid pages make it clear that the website operator is named "Ledger Markets". The copyright notice at the foot of the website associated with the disputed domain name <ledgermarketsapp.com> likewise makes it clear that the website operator is named "Ledger Markets".

On November 20, 2024, the United Kingdom Financial Conduct Authority ("FCA") published a warning notice regarding an entity named "Ledger Markets", using the domain name <ledger-markets.com>. The notice asserts that this firm is not authorized by the FCA, may be providing or promoting financial services or products without the FCA's permission, and may be targeting people in the United Kingdom. The notice also states, "You should avoid dealing with this firm and beware of scams." The contact details noted by the FCA for this firm include the address provided on the website associated with the disputed domain name <ledgermarketsapp.com>. The notice adds, "Some firms may give incorrect contact details including postal addresses, telephone numbers and email addresses. They may change these contact details over time."

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that its respective complaints against the Respondents should be consolidated as the websites in respect of the disputed domain names appear to be under common control due to their similarity, and near-identity, in both text and graphics. The Complainant asserts that both of the disputed domain names contain its LEDGER trademark, used in combination with non-distinctive word elements, such that they are confusingly similar thereto.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, adding that its LEDGER mark is of a longstanding nature, and is extremely well-known, that its rights long predate the registration date of the disputed domain names, that the Respondents were not commonly known as "Ledger" at the date of registration of the disputed domain names (referencing the Complainant's Google search on the term and its social media presences), that the Respondents have no non-infringing activities under the disputed domain names, that the websites associated with the disputed domain names suggest that the Respondents are active in the cryptocurrency business, yet the company mentioned on said websites does not exist at United Kingdom Companies House.

The Complainant adds that the company "Ledger Markets" claims to be an authorized financial institution while the FCA states that said entity "may be providing or promoting financial services or products without our permission" and warns the reader to "avoid dealing with this firm", and an industry website named

“BrokerChooser” states that “Ledger Markets” “is not a trusted broker”. The Complainant argues that these elements support the view that the Respondents are not making a bona fide offering of goods or services under the disputed domain names but intend to use the associated websites for potentially fraudulent activities and scams. The Complainant asserts that the relevant public, when confronted with the disputed domain names, will expect them to be related to the Complainant’s activities, which will lead to them being misled and will discredit the Complainant’s goods and services. The Complainant also contends that it has neither licensed nor authorized the Respondents to use the Complainant’s mark in connection with disputed domain names or for other purposes, adding that the presence of such mark in the disputed domain names suggests the Complainant’s sponsorship or endorsement of them.

The Complainant asserts that its international notoriety in the financial field means that there is no chance that the disputed domain names were registered by coincidence, adding that a simple Internet search on Google would have disclosed the Complainant’s long-term activities under the LEDGER mark, while the Complainant’s trademarks are freely available to review in online databases. The Complainant refers to a previous case under the Policy in which the respondent’s deemed knowledge of the Complainant’s marks at the time of registration of the concerned domain name was held to be evidence of registration and use in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that it is highly probable that the Respondents wished to take advantage of the Complainant’s reputation to trick users into thinking they were accessing the Complainant’s official website, or for other commercial gain arising from a potential affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondents are using the notoriety of the Complainant to secure traffic to their websites and to obtain commercial gain from the false impression created with regard to a potential affiliation or connection with the Complainant. The Complainant adds that the notoriety and reputation of its LEDGER mark means that the Respondents could not put the disputed domain names to any legitimate use. The Complainant adds that the Respondents are claiming to be an accredited financial institution when this is false.

B. Respondent

The Respondents did not file a formal Response to the Complainant’s contentions, although in an unsigned informal email to the Center of February 12, 2025, an entity seemingly named “Clickcom Clickcom”, apparently writing as, or on behalf of, one of the Respondent(s) (based upon the author’s email address, the writer is presumably the registrant of the disputed domain name <ledger966.com>) stated that it opposed the grouping of multiple domain names under the same Complaint because no evidence had been produced that the disputed domain names are connected. Secondly, this entity stated that “ledger” is a universally recognized financial term used in accounting, banking, and financial record-keeping, adding that a simple search on a major online retailer’s website (evidence provided) results in hundreds of unrelated products such as “ledger sheets, accounting ledgers, and finance record books”. The Respondent asserted that the Complainant does not own exclusive rights to a common word that has been used in finance for centuries, adding that the Complainant is attempting to monopolize a generic financial term in violation of fair competition laws. The entity contended that the Complainant is not trustworthy because its online reviews expose serious allegations of fraud, lost funds, and security failures, such that the Complainant is not acting in good faith, and is using legal complaints to suppress competition.

Finally, the Respondent contended that the website associated with the (unspecified) disputed domain name provides stock market signals and is completely unrelated to the Complainant’s offerings (noting it does not explain to which of the two disputed domain names or related websites it is referring). The Respondent went on to assert that the Complainant has failed to show actual confusion between the (unspecified) website associated with the (unspecified) disputed domain name and the Complainant’s business, and that a decision in the Complainant’s favor would endorse the “stealing” of domain names using generic words without merit. The Respondent concluded that this is a case of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking and requested that the appropriate finding be made.

The Panel has treated these as submissions made by one of the Respondents in respect of both of the disputed domain names and refers to the author of the abovementioned email as “the Respondent” for convenience in the remainder of this Decision.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Consideration: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

In the informal email communication to the Center on February 12, 2025, the Respondent indicated that it was opposed to the Complainant's request. However, the Respondent did not engage with the Complainant's submissions as to the near-identity of the websites associated with the disputed domain names.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that while the registrants are nominally different, the websites associated with the disputed domain names are virtually identical, making use of the same text and graphics including the logo described in the factual background section above, and the same image of a demo account featuring a multicolored graph and a mobile telephone screenshot. Indeed, the image file concerned has the same file name despite being on two different websites. The said websites are both operated by an entity named "Ledger Markets". While the Registrars are also nominally different, the disputed domain names are both delegated to nameservers operated on the <cloudflare.com> platform. The websites associated with the disputed domain names appear to be in similar IP blocks.

The Panel notes that the Respondent merely sought to oppose the Complainant's request for consolidation without further exposition, and did not address specifically the Complainant's submissions on common control, notably incorporating the presentation of multiple side-by-side screenshots of the websites associated with the disputed domain names in which the near-identity is evident. In consequence of such screenshots in particular, and in the absence of any meaningful opposing arguments from the Respondent, the Panel finds that said websites are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

To the extent that the Complainant relies upon its figurative LEDGER MARKET trademark, the Panel notes that the word elements of this mark are readily severable from the graphical elements, which do not overtake the word elements in prominence. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

Although the addition of other terms, in the case of the disputed domain name <ledgermarketsapp.com> (this being compared to the Complainant's LEDGER MARKET trademark), the letter "s" and the word "app", and in the case of the disputed domain name <ledger966.com> (this being compared to the Complainant's LEDGER trademark), the number "966", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the respective mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 names, based upon its assertions that its mark is of a longstanding nature, and is well-known, that its rights therein predate the registration of the disputed domain names, that the Respondent is not commonly known as "ledger", and that the entities named on the websites associated with the disputed domain names do not appear to exist, and are not registered for the provision of the claimed services, suggesting that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant points to a specific warning by the FCA, described in the factual background section above, in which it advises consumers not to do business with an entity named "Ledger Markets" that is linked to the disputed domain name <ledger966.com> by way of having the same organization name on the associated website, and to the disputed domain name <ledgermarketsapp.com> by way of having the same contact address on the associated website.

The Panel therefore turns to the Respondent's case in rebuttal. The essence of the Respondent's contentions is that it is entitled to use the term "ledger" because this is a universally recognized financial term, in other words, a dictionary word. The Panel accepts that the word "ledger" is a dictionary word, having the meaning contended for by the Respondent, among others. Indeed, the Panel recalls physical client account ledgers having just been phased out in the early days of its professional practice, while their functional replacement, computer terminals, were still referred to as "the ledger" at that time. The Panel is therefore aware that "ledger" is a term that originally related to physical financial record-keeping, and likewise understands that it has since been adopted in digital applications, most recently in the Complainant's world of cryptocurrency where it references the blockchain, essentially a series of decentralized digital financial records, or a "digital ledger". However, the fact that the word is a dictionary term is not the end of the matter.

Panels have recognized that merely registering a domain name comprised of a dictionary word or phrase does not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the respondent; panels have held that mere arguments that a domain name corresponds to a dictionary term/phrase will not necessarily suffice. In order to find rights or legitimate interests in a domain name based on its dictionary meaning, the domain name may not be used to trade off third-party trademark rights. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10.1. The section goes on to note that panels tend to look at factors such as the status and fame of the relevant mark

and whether the respondent has registered and legitimately used other domain names containing dictionary words or phrases in connection with the respective dictionary meaning.

The fame of the Complainant's mark here is considerable. It could conceivably be argued that, at least as far as online financial applications are concerned, the LEDGER mark has displaced the original dictionary meaning. The problem for the Respondent's case is that it is exactly online financial activity that the disputed domain names and associated websites target. The websites may not be directly concerned with cryptocurrency or the blockchain, as is the Complainant, but they are engaged in promoting an "app" or application for financial activities, allegedly for "stock market signals", under the same name, "ledger", as the Complainant's "Ledger Live" financial app. Given the substantial fame of the Complainant's LEDGER mark, as discussed in the factual background section above, the Panel does not consider that the relevant public would be likely to distinguish between the Complainant and the disputed domain names on the basis of a dictionary word connotation, but rather that they would make the assumption that the Complainant had developed a stock market app to complement its "Ledger Live" app, and its other financial products and services. This is something that the Respondent could not have overlooked when it decided to use the term "ledger" as part of the disputed domain names.

Crucially, while the Respondent makes reference to the dictionary term "ledger" by discussing products such as "ledger sheets, accounting ledgers, and finance record books", it is notable that the Respondent does not use the term in this way at all, either in the composition of the disputed domain names or within the corresponding websites. The Respondent is not promoting the use or supply of "ledgers", as such, or any form of financial record-keeping suggestive of that dictionary term, and notably it is not engaged with the term in the same descriptive way as a retailer's website. The Respondent's use of the term in connection with an online financial application is likely to give rise to confusion among the relevant public as discussed above, noting that contrary to the Respondent's submissions, it is not necessary for the Complainant to show actual confusion if, as here, the Panel finds that a likelihood of confusion is present. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services via the disputed domain names, noting also that the Respondent's activities appear to be commercial in nature.

It should be noted in particular that the Respondent did not engage to any extent with the Complainant's submissions regarding the Respondent's lack of any proper registration in the United Kingdom, where the websites associated with the disputed domain names claim to be based, either in the form of corporate or regulatory compliance. Notably, the Respondent did not even attempt to deny that the alert from the FCA referred to its operations and activities. In the absence of any suitable explanation being tendered in response to the Complainant's concerns, or any potential alternative explanation being evident to the Panel, the Panel finds it reasonable to infer that the disputed domain names may have been registered in connection with illegal activities. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such activities, whether phishing, distributing malware, collection of personal data without authority, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

In all of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

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 Respondent cannot credibly claim to have selected the disputed domain names without an awareness of the Complainant and its LEDGER trademarks. The Complainant is highly active in the financial services sector, as demonstrated by the materials before the European Union Intellectual Property Office, all as discussed in the factual background section above. Its use of the term "ledger" appears to transcend the dictionary meaning, at least as far as online financial activities are concerned, as evidenced by the results of the Google search for that word produced by the Complainant, in which it is

referenced in every first page result. In particular, it is notable that the Respondent did not take issue with any of that evidence and did not deny prior knowledge of the Complainant, merely arguing that its activities were different from those in which the Complainant engages and relate to the dictionary term “ledger”, an approach that the Panel has already rejected in the preceding section.

Consequently, it seems more probable than not to the Panel that the Respondent wished to take advantage of the Complainant’s reputation to suggest to users that the disputed domain names would lead to the Complainant’s official website, or to make commercial gains that would arise from a perceived affiliation with, or endorsement, by the Complainant. The Panel therefore finds that by using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the corresponding websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of said websites, contrary to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

It is also notable that the Respondent did not engage with the Complainant’s concerns that the disputed domain names may have been registered in connection with illegal activities, supported by its evidence of a lack of formal compliance in the United Kingdom, where the websites associated with the disputed domain names claim to be based. These are serious allegations, supported by compelling evidence notably in the form of the FCA warning, and they call for an answer from the Respondent which is markedly lacking here, suggesting that there is likely to be some substance to the allegations made.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for activity, such as here, alleged fraudulent activities and scams, as is suggested by the lack of financial services/regulatory credentials or corporate registration of the Respondent, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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

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 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. 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 Respondent requested a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking on the basis that the Complaint was without merit, notably on the issue of the alleged dictionary word nature of the term “ledger” in the disputed domain names. However, given that the Panel has found in the Complainant’s favor in respect of the Complaint, it need not address such request.

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 names <ledgermarketsapp.com> and <ledger966.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/

Andrew D. S. Lothian

Sole Panelist

Date: March 28, 2025