

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Nomura International Plc. v. camilo david

Case No. D2025-0854

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Nomura International Plc., United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Potter Clarkson AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is camilo david, India.

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

The disputed domain name <nomuratradeia.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 28, 2025. On March 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 3, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 5, 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 March 6, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 March 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Tuukka Airaksinen as the sole panelist in this matter on April 4, 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, Nomura International Plc, is a company within the Nomura financial services group (the “Nomura Group”). Nomura was formally founded in 1925 in Osaka, Japan and since that date has grown to have a presence in over 30 countries, employing over 27,000 employees globally. Nomura Holdings, Inc., the ultimate holding company for the Nomura Group, is listed on the Tokyo Stock Exchange.

The Complainant is the holder of trade marks for the word NOMURA, including EU Trade Mark Number EU002615136, UK Trade Mark Number UK00002169140 (registered on June 4, 1999) and India Trade Mark Number 1527315.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 18, 2024, and resolved to the website of International Securities & Commodities Alerts Network (I-SCAN) but and at the time of the decision, resolved to an inactive page.

#### **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 disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant’s distinctive “NOMURA” marks which has been held by WIPO to normally be considered identical or confusingly similar ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 1.7).

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not using it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate or fair use. The Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use its trade mark for the purpose of registering domain names, or for use on any website or otherwise.

The disputed domain name hosted a login / registration page which redirects users to a subdomain. The credentials submitted by the users in the registration process are then transmitted to another domain. To increase the likelihood of the scam succeeding, the Respondent lists on the website Nomura’s real office addresses of Germany and Spain and the real license / reference numbers of Nomura’s registration with the regulators in Italy and Spain.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

In order to obtain the transfer of a domain name, a complainant must prove the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, regardless of whether the respondent files a response to the complaint or not. The first element is that the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the complainant has rights. The second element a complainant must prove is that the respondent has no

rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name. The third element a complainant must establish is that the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term "tradeia" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for here, claimed as applicable to this case: impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is used for illegal purposes such as phishing and the Respondent has not contended this claim.

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. The disputed domain name has obviously been created on the reputation of the Complainant's trade mark to mislead Internet users to believe that this is the Complainant's website in order to gather information about the users.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for phishing or fraud 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 name constitutes 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 <nomuratradeia.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Tuukka Airaksinen/*

**Tuukka Airaksinen**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2025