

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ivan Opria, EOLabs LLC v. Fedorov Vladimir
Case No. D2025-1386

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Ivan Opria, Cyprus and EOLabs LLC, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Fedorov Vladimir, Kazakhstan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <expert-option-trading.com> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 4, 2025. On April 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 7, 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 Complainants on April 8, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on April 8, 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 April 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Rebecca Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on May 13, 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 Complainants to this proceeding are Ivan Opria ("First Complainant"), the manager and owner of EOLabs LLC ("Second Complainant"). The Complainants are collectively referred to hereafter as "the Complainant", unless it is necessary to refer to them separately.

The Complainant operates the website at the <expertooption.com> domain name ("Complainant's Website"). The Complainant's Website is used in relation to the Expert Option platform. The platform was launched in 2014 and became one of the top three most downloaded financial apps worldwide on Google Play. As at the date the Complaint was filed, the app had over 70 million active users.

The First Complainant holds registrations for the EXPERTOOPTION trade mark in numerous jurisdictions, including European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 015757784 for EXPERTOOPTION composite mark (registered December 13, 2016) and United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration UK00915757784 for EXPERTOOPTION composite mark (registered December 13, 2016) (the "Trade Mark").

The First Complainant is also the registrant of the <expertooption.com> domain name.

The Respondent is an individual apparently located in Kazakhstan. The Respondent did not submit a response, and consequently little information is known about the Respondent.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on October 28, 2024.

The disputed domain name currently redirects to the <legendaryplaces.org> domain name, which hosts a website that provides information and links to various trading apps (e.g., Quotex and Binomo). At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name redirected to the same domain name and website, but the content displayed on the website replicated the content of the Complainant's Website.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Trade Mark in its entirety. The additional word "trading" does not alter this confusing similarity, rather, it enhances confusion by referring to the Complainant's main business activity.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not received any permission from the Complainant to register the Trade Mark as a domain name or to offer goods and services under the Trade Mark. The disputed domain name redirects to a website which copies the Complainant's logotype and the content of the Complainant's Website.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent. The Respondent was aware of the Complainant's business and Trade Mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent is trying to take advantage of the Trade Mark to draw traffic to the website at the disputed domain name in order to commercially profit from the likelihood of confusion. The Respondent is impersonating the Complainant. This is evidence of bad

faith and fraud. Additionally, the Respondent has been subject to other UDPR complaints, evidencing a pattern of abuse.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on 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 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 Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the term "trading" and hyphens between each word comprising the disputed domain name) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements 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.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Trade Mark and there is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been known by the disputed domain name.

The evidence provided by the Complainant (i.e., screenshots of the Complainant's Website and the website to which the disputed domain name reverts) indicates that the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate the Complainant and its business. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as impersonation/passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

The Panel finds it unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and the Trade Mark, given the worldwide reputation of the Complainant and the composition of the disputed domain name which includes the Trade Mark and the term "trading" which is descriptive of the Complainant's business. The Respondent's goal in registering and using the disputed domain name appears to be to attract Internet users for potential gain. This finding is reinforced by the Respondent's initial use of the website at the disputed domain name to replicate the Complainant's Website and the current use to display links to competitor trading platforms.

Additionally, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as impersonation/passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

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 <expert-option-trading.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Rebecca Slater/

Rebecca Slater

Sole Panelist

Date: May 19, 2025