

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dragoneer Investment Group, LLC v. Srinivas Varma
Case No. D2025-1867

1. The Parties

Complainant is Dragoneer Investment Group, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Ropes & Gray LLP, United States

Respondent is Srinivas Varma, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dragoneergrowth.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 9, 2025. On May 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 12, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and its contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 May 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 9, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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

According to the Complaint:

“The Complainant, Dragoneer Investment Group, was founded in 2012 and incorporated in Delaware to provide growth-oriented investments to businesses. The Complainant provides investments to and partners with management teams to grow companies and deliver returns, and has done so since 2012. [...] The Complainant has used marks consisting of or including DRAGONEER continuously since at least as early as 2012. [...] The Complainant, and its use of its DRAGONEER marks in connection with its financial services, has attracted substantial press and media attention worldwide.”

Annexed to the Complaint are several media reports discussing major investment transactions involving firms including Uber, Airbnb, and Spotify, each of which identifies Complainant (as “Dragoneer”) as one of the participants in the transaction. The record also indicates that Complainant’s LinkedIn social media page has more than 11,000 followers.

Complainant holds a registered trademark for DRAGONEER, registered on January 14, 2014, with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Reg. No. 4467383, in connection with “financial services, namely, investment management, investment advice, investment consultation, investment of funds for others; fund investment services, namely, hedge fund, private equity, hybrid, venture capital, and other private funds; operation and management of hedge funds, private equity funds, hybrid funds, venture capital funds, and other private funds; alternative asset management.” This registration indicates that Complainant’s first commercial use of the DRAGONEER mark was August 18, 2012.

Complainant owns the domain name <dragoneer.com> and uses that domain name to host its commercial website and for employee emails.

The Domain Name was registered on July 15, 2020. According to the Complaint:

“Complainant, not Respondent, originally registered the [Domain Name] on July 15, 2020, and used that Domain Name from August 13, 2020, to September 18, 2024, in connection with its own services. Although Complainant intended to renew the [Domain Name], its vendor failed to do so, and the [Domain Name] lapsed, upon which the Respondent registered the [Domain Name].”

Annexed to the Complaint are screenshots from the Wayback Machine (“www.archive.org”) dated September 14, 2024, and September 18, 2024, for the website to which the Domain Name resolved. On the former date, the website resolved to a website describing and promoting Complainant and its financial services. On the latter date, four days later, the Domain Name resolved to a gambling website.

As of April 24, 2025, the Domain Name redirected to a gambling website that required users to log in.

Respondent has not disputed any of the foregoing allegations, nor challenged any of the evidence annexed to the Complaint.

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.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

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

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that Complainant has rights in the mark DRAGONEER through registration and use demonstrated in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the DRAGONEER mark. Notwithstanding the additional word "growth," the DRAGONEER mark is clearly recognizable within the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in connection with the Domain Name. Respondent has not come forward in this proceeding to articulate his bona fides vis-à-vis the Domain Name, or to dispute Complainant's plausible allegations and credible evidence. On the undisputed record here, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent was aware of Complainant's DRAGONEER mark when registering the Domain Name. Among other reasons, the fact that the word "growth" is closely associated with investing and finance suggests that Respondent was aware of the DRAGONEER mark. It also appears more likely than not, noting that Complainant was the previous owner of the Domain Name, that Respondent acquired the Domain Name to capitalize on the goodwill associated with Complainant's mark by redirecting the Domain Name toward a commercial gambling website. Such conduct does not vest Respondent with a legitimate interest in the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation," are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in "bad faith":

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel concludes that Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith under the Policy. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the "Rights or Legitimate Interests" section. On this undisputed record, the Panel finds that Respondent more likely than not targeted Complainant's DRAGONEER mark when registering the Domain Name, and has used the Domain Name for illegitimate commercial gain by seeking to divert Internet traffic to a commercial website. This constitutes bad faith registration and use within the meaning of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 <dragoneergrowth.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: June 21, 2025