

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dell Inc. v. Abdullah Al Zubair
Case No. D2025-1822

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dell Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by AZB & Partners, India.

The Respondent is Abdullah Al Zubair, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dell-event.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2025. On May 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 8, 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 (Privacy Protect, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 8, 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 May 9, 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 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2025. An informal Response was filed with the Center on May 15, 2025. On May 21 and 26, 2025, the Center sent reminders to the Respondent about the due date for the Response. On June 5, 2025, the Center informed the Parties about the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process.


The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 Complainant is an American technology company founded by Michael Dell in 1984. It sells computer hardware, software, peripherals, computer-oriented products, and provides computer-related services. It operates its official website at the domain name <dell.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for DELL (the “DELL trademark”), including the following representative registrations:

- the United States trademark **DELL** (word) with registration No. 1616571, registered on October 9, 1990 for goods in International Class 9;
- the United States trademark **DELL** with registration No. 1860272, registered on October 25, 1994 for goods in International Class 9;
- the European Union trademark **DELL** with registration No. 000083345, registered on March 26, 1998 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16, and 37;
- the Bangladeshi trademark **DELL** (word) with registration No. 36590, registered on December 7, 1992 for goods in International Class 9; and
- the Bangladeshi trademark **DELL** with registration No. 36591, registered on December 7, 1992 for goods in International Class 9.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 20, 2023. It resolves to a website offering events planning and management services provided by Dell Event & Logistics Limited, registered in 2023 in Bangladesh. The Respondent’s website displays the logo .

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that it has been using the DELL trademark for many years, that its products have been widely available in Bangladesh since the 1990s, and that it is well recognized by the consuming public, which associates the DELL trademark with it. The Complainant claims that it is the world’s largest direct seller of computer systems. The Complainant points out that its subsidiaries, authorized distributors and resellers in Bangladesh have limited rights to use the DELL trademark and trade name in Bangladesh, and that its official website at the domain name <dell.com> provides extensive information on the activities of the Complainant in Bangladesh and details about its products, stores and authorized service centers there.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its DELL trademark.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its well-known DELL trademark and must have used the Complainant’s products. The Complainant submits that the website at the disputed domain name displays a variation of its DELL trademark and repeatedly uses the abbreviation “DELL” instead of the full name Dhaka Event & Logistics Ltd. of its provider, thus misleading visitors that the Respondent is affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant. The Complainant notes that the Respondent’s entity was formerly known as Star Presentation Technology.

According to the Complainant, this entity purposely chose to change its name to Dhaka Event & Logistics Ltd. so that it can be abbreviated as DELL with no legitimate reason to do so, because “DELL” has no dictionary meaning and is associated by the public only with the products and services of the Complainant. The Complainant adds that the Respondent adopted the DELL trademark to offer technology-related goods and services, which are cognate or identical to the goods and services offered by the Complainant and which are included in the scope of protection of the DELL trademark, thus increasing the likelihood of confusion in the consuming public, which would associate the Respondent with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name to mislead Internet users into believing that it is associated to the Complainant and to offer them goods and services that are similar to those of the Complainant for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

The Respondent states that the disputed domain name is owned and operated by its company Dhaka Event & Logistics Limited (DELL), a legally-registered company in Bangladesh. The Respondent submits that the acronym “DELL” stands for its company’s full name and is not intended to reference or infringe upon the trademarks of any other party. The Respondent maintains that it has selected this name as a natural abbreviation of its business identity and has consistently used it in good faith for conducting genuine business activities including event management and logistics services across Bangladesh. The Respondent points out that the disputed domain name has not been offered for sale or used to mislead the public or take unfair advantage of the reputation of any other trademark.

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 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 the DELL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the DELL trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the DELL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “events”) 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 DELL trademark 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 Respondent submits that its company name is Dhaka Event & Logistics Ltd., abbreviated as “DELL”. However, it does not explain why it adopted this name and acronym, replacing the previous name, Star Presentation Technology. When businesses use acronyms instead of their full names, they usually do not include letters in the acronym referring to the legal form of the company (here, “limited”). The word “event” is included in the disputed domain name after the acronym “DELL”, even though it is already included in the acronym. The word “logistics” in the company name does not appear to reflect any of the activities offered by the company on its website. The official language in Bangladesh is Bengali, yet the Respondent’s company name and website are only in English. The logo used on the Respondent’s website makes a visual impression that evokes the Complainant’s trademark, because the letter “E” in both of them has a unique design that differs significantly from the other letters in plain script. The Respondent does not deny its knowledge of the Complainant, and the DELL trademark has been validly registered and used in Bangladesh for many years for computer and electronic goods and related services which are similar to those offered on the Respondent’s website, which moreover contains no disclaimer regarding the lack of relationship with the Complainant.

While each of these observations might not be decisive on its own, collectively, they call into question the Respondent’s assertion that the acronym “DELL” is not intended to mislead the public or take unfair advantage of any third-party trademark. Rather, it appears that the Respondent chose the new company name Dhaka Event & Logistics Ltd. to justify using the acronym “DELL” in the disputed domain name and on the associated website, and to attract traffic and gain a commercial advantage from the goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 Respondent does not deny its knowledge of the Complainant and its DELL trademark. Given the long-term and widespread registration and use of this trademark in many countries, it is likely that the Respondent knew of the DELL trademark when registering the disputed domain name. As discussed in the section on rights and legitimate interests, the circumstances of this case support a conclusion that the Respondent chose its new company name to justify using the acronym “DELL” in the disputed domain name and on the associated website, and is using this acronym in an attempt to exploit the goodwill of the DELL trademark to attract visitors to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the same trademark as to the affiliation or endorsement of the services offered on the Respondent’s website. This

supports a finding of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <dell-event.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: June 23, 2025