

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Postman, Inc. v. Alexandre Rogerio

Case No. D2025-1700

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Postman, Inc., United States of America, represented by BEST Rechtsanwälte, Germany.

The Respondent is Alexandre Rogerio, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <api-postman.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (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 name. On April 28, 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 (Domain Administrator / See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 30, 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 April 30, 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 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 offers an Application Programming Interface (“API”) platform for building and using APIs, whose services are used by over 20 million developers worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner the trademark POSTMAN registered in the United States of America Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) on November 13, 2018 (reg. no. 5605649) . The Complainant also has registrations in other jurisdictions.

The Complainant operates a website located at “www.postman.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 29, 2025. The disputed domain name is currently not active.

However, before filing the complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that showed the Complainant’s earlier device mark in the upper center followed by the Complainant’s earlier word mark in the instructional header to the account credential fields with the legend “Sign in to Postman”. The bottom area of the website operated under the disputed domain name indicated the Complainant as the creator and copyright holder for this website and contains deep link references to the terms of use and the privacy policy published on the Complainant’s website. The Complainant’s earlier word mark is also automatically shown in the web browser tabulator accompanied by the head of the Complainant’s logo.

The disputed domain name was used for the operation of a website largely granting access to learning material taken from the Complainant’s API learning platform available at the Complainant website at “https://learning.postman.com” along with Chinese translations of this material to make this material publicly available in China.

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.

According to the Complainant, each of the three elements specified in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in the present case.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark registrations of the Complainant.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Third, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

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

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondent's default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

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 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 terms like "api" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, as it was used to operate a website that largely reproduced learning material taken from the Complainant's API learning platform (available at "https://learning.postman.com"), along with Chinese translations of such material, for the purpose of making it publicly available in China without authorization.

In addition, the Panel finds the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and the addition of the term "API" (the acronym API stands for "Application Programming Interface") related to the commercial activities of the Complainant creates a risk of Internet user confusion.

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 Complainant's services under its POSTMAN trademarks are used by over 20 million developers worldwide;
- the Complainant has marketed and sold its services using the POSTMAN trademark since 2012, which is well before the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name only recently on March 29, 2025.
- the Respondent registered a domain name containing the POSTMAN trademark of the Complainant with the term "api". The additional term "api" is closely associated with the Complainant's services for APIs. Thus, by registering a domain name that incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the associated term "api", the Respondent has created a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, as well as its domain name. As such, the Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with the Complainant's brand and business.
- the Respondent is in default.

In light of these facts, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's website or location. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 <api-postman.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2025