

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GMO Internet Group, Inc., GMO Cybersecurity by Ierae, Inc. v. Idah Idah
Case No. D2025-1684

1. The Parties

The Complainants are GMO Internet Group, Inc. (the “first Complainant”), Japan, and its subsidiary GMO Cybersecurity by Ierae, Inc. (the “second Complainant”), Japan, represented by BrandShelter, France.

The Respondent is Idah Idah, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <gmocybersecurity.com> and <gmocybersecurity.pro> are registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 25, 2025. On April 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 29, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on May 5, 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 May 12, 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 May 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on June 26, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The first Complainant is an Internet infrastructure company founded in 1991 with headquarters in Tokyo, Japan. Moreover, the first Complainant holds over 80 percent of Japan's domain registration market through its flagship registrar Onamae.com, which was Asia's first ICANN-accredited registrar and manages over 33 million domain names. Internationally, the first Complainant ranks among the top 10 global registrars of domain names.

The first Complainant is a critical force in Japan's digital economy and a trusted name in global domain services and cybersecurity. The first Complainant is highly regarded in Japan for its technical expertise.

Additionally, the first Complainant offers a wide range of services such as hosting, security, online payment processing, advertising and fintech solutions. The first Complainant revenues approximately around USD 1.8 billion in 2024 and comprises over 100 subsidiaries. The second Complainant is one the first Complainant's key subsidiaries. It was founded in 2011 as Ierae Security and became part of the first Complainant in 2022. The second Complainant specializes in advanced cybersecurity services. The Panel will refer to the Complainants in singular as the "Complainant" unless there is a need to distinguish between the two.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations consisting of the element "gmo" either alone or in combination with "cyber security". These trademark registrations include, but are not limited to:

- the European Union trademark (word) GMO with number 005870639, registered on July 30, 2009 for classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 42 and 45;
- the International trademark registration (word/device) GMO with number 1522646, registered on June 28, 2019 for classes 9, 11, 16, 24, 25, 28, 32, and 35 through 45, designating several jurisdictions, including Canada, China, the European Union and the United States of America; and
- the Japanese trademark registration (word/device) GMO CYBER SECURITY BY IERAE サイバー攻撃対策サイト with number 6778501, registered on February 14, 2024 for classes 9, 35, 41 and 42.

Moreover, the Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names composed of the beforementioned trademarks, including <gmo-cybersecurity.com>, registered since January 24, 2022.

The disputed domain names were both registered on December 12, 2024 and currently resolve to inactive pages but were previously used to redirect Internet users to a variety of different websites including those with adult related content and malware dissemination.

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 the following:

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks. The disputed domain names result from the GMO trademark and the generic terms "cyber security". Moreover, it is well-established that in cases where the distinctive and prominent element of a disputed domain name is a registered trademark and the only variation is the addition of a generic word or a number, such variation does not typically negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent does not use and has not used, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Moreover, these are used to redirect Internet users to adult related content and malware disseminating websites, which does not constitute legitimate use of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Respondent does not use the disputed domain names for any legitimate or noncommercial fair use.

The disputed domain names were registered in bad faith. The Respondent has made active use of the disputed domain names in effort to redirect users to dubious websites, potentially for the Respondent personal pecuniary gain. This clearly demonstrates bad faith registration and use under the Policy. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names primarily for the purposes of disrupting the Complainant's business.

Moreover, the fact that the disputed domain names are listed on domain name reselling platforms underpins that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names to take advantage of the Complainant and make an unfair profit. The Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark rights.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation

The present proceeding involves the Complainant bringing a single Complaint against one Respondent relating to two disputed domain names. The Complainant has requested consolidation of the proceedings relating to both disputed domain names.

Such request is not needed as paragraph 3(c) of the Rules applies, which 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, and the disputed domain names were registered by the same Respondent.

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

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. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, as the Complainant’s evidence shows that the disputed domain names previously resolved to different websites including the one with malware dissemination, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to redirect Internet users to a variety of different websites including those with adult related content and malware dissemination. Given the fact that the disputed domain names include the mark GMO in combination with “cyber security” related to services provided by the Complainant, the Complainant’s prior registered domain name <gmo-cybersecurity.com>, and lacking of a response, it is more than plausible that the Respondent had the Complainant and its marks in mind when registering and using the disputed domain names. As such the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

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 illegitimate purposes constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, including the fact that the Respondent has provided false address details, 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.

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 <gmocybersecurity.com> and <gmocybersecurity.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: July 10, 2025.