

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

CoachHub GmbH v. Jansam Liaosopa  
Case No. D2025-1148

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is CoachHub GmbH, Germany, represented by JBB Rechtsanwälte Jaschinski Biere Brexl Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

Respondent is Jansam Liaosopa, United States of America ("US").

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

The disputed domain name <coachhubtalentpredict.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 21, 2025. On March 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 24, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from named Respondent (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 26, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 27, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 20, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on April 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Clive L. Elliott K.C., as the sole panelist in this matter on May 6, 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

Complainant is a global talent development platform that offers digital coaching services in various subjects through its online platform. It was founded in 2018 with its principal place of business in Berlin, Germany. As well as having offices around the world, it also offers digital coaching services to over 1,000 business clients worldwide. Complainant employs over 400 staff across Europe, North America, Asia and Australia and works with more than 3,500 business coaches in 90 countries.

Complainant is the owner of 53 registrations for the trade mark “COACHHUB” (“Complainant’s Mark”) which it uses for its digital coaching services, including but not limited to:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Registration No.	Registration Date	Classes
	European Union	018078446	October 9, 2019	09, 41
COACH HUB	Canada	TMA1070275	January 21, 2020	09, 18, 25, 35, 38, 41, 42, 44, 45
	Germany	302021116560	November 5, 2021	09, 35, 36, 38, 41, 41
CoachHub	International	1 637 259	August 10, 2021	09, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42

According to the publicly available WhoIs, the Domain Name was registered on March 5, 2025, and at the date of this Complaint, it resolved to a parked web page displaying sponsored links of companies. The Domain Name has been used to send fraudulent email communications.

#### 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.

Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s Mark as it contains the Mark in its entirety, together with the words “talent” and “predict”. Complainant states that the addition of these words could be easily misunderstood by the consumer as an official initiative to recruit and hire new talent, and that these words are insufficient to distinguish the Domain Name from Complainant’s Mark as they refer to “coachhub” as the origin of the talent recruitment initiative.

Complainant asserts that its YouTube channel has 1,140 subscribers, listing 205 videos, and its LinkedIn page has 102,000 followers. It therefore contends that Complainant’s Mark is famous or widely known.

Complainant further states that there is no evidence of Respondent's use of the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is Respondent commonly known by the Domain Name. Complainant goes on to contend that Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith, solely to create email addresses that falsely suggest it is the official website and email addresses of Complainant. The Domain Name's zone file is configured with Mail Exchange ("MX") records and Sender Policy Framework ("SPF") records, which means that the Domain Name can be used for email communication. Complainant states that Respondent is using the Domain Name to contact job seekers and professionals with a fake job offer, from emails such as: [...]@coachhubtalentpredict.com.

Complainant points out that the Domain Name is effectively impersonating Complainant, with any email originating from the Domain Name carrying a high risk of implied affiliation not only misleading potential staff, but also Complainant's employees, subsidiaries etc, constituting illegitimate, bad faith use.

Complainant states that it has been made aware of at least eight cases of fraud and has strong reason to believe there are significantly more. Victims are being approached via those email addresses and lured into continuing communication, whereby the scheme falsely claims that CoachHub is recruiting for a Full-Time Remote Leadership Coach position offering an attractive six-figure salary. Complainant is aware that potential victims are then deceived into sharing sensitive personal information by completing a questionnaire, and are asked to sign counterfeit employment agreements. Complainant submits therefore that the Domain Name has been registered in bad faith to give Respondent the ability to send fraudulent email communications to engage in phishing, spamming, or employment scams.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to 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 Complainant's Mark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Complainant's Mark is recognizable within the Domain Name. That is, on the basis that the Domain Name differs only to the extent of adding the words "talent" and "predict". Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the words "talent" and "predict" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the addition of the words does not, in and of itself, prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a 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 respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on complainant). If respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Of particular significance in the present case, it is alleged that the Domain Name’s zone file is configured with MX records and SPF records. MX records are used for email delivery, providing a mechanism for directing incoming emails to a mail server based on the particular domain name. Such activity on its own is not indicative of any rights or legitimate interests, and carries a risk that the Domain Name may be used to impersonate Complainant. In this regard, the composition of the Domain Name, incorporating Complainant’s Mark with the words “talent” and “predict” (which Internet users might reasonably associate with a site providing access to coaching opportunities with Complainant), carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Moreover, there is no evidence that Respondent is actually commonly known by the Domain Name. Rather, in the circumstances of this case, it appears the choice of Respondent organization in the fraudulent emails (CoachHub Recruitment Team) was intended to falsely suggest an affiliation with Complainant or otherwise mislead Internet users attempting to determine the authenticity of the Domain Name.

Accordingly, 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 Panel notes that the composition of the Domain Name, incorporating Complainant’s Mark with terms related to its operations, suggests Respondent knew of and sought to take advantage of Complainant’s Mark when registering the Domain Name.

As noted above, Respondent has engaged in questionable activities, namely embedding the confusingly similar Domain Name with, at least, MX records. Respondent has not put forward any credible explanation for the choice of Domain Name, and the Panel considers that there is a significant risk that emails originating from the Domain Name would be misleading or deceptive, falsely suggesting a connection with Complainant. There is evidence of Internet users being misled as to the true identity of Respondent. Further, Respondent has sent fraudulent email communications to engage in phishing, spamming, or employment scams. None of these allegations are denied by Respondent.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <coachhubtalentpredict.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Clive L. Elliott K.C./*

**Clive L. Elliott K.C.**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 20, 2025