

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ANI Technologies Pvt. Ltd. v. J. K.

Case No. D2025-1989

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ANI Technologies Pvt. Ltd., India, represented by Lakshmikumaran & Sridharan, Attorneys, India.

The Respondent is J. K., United States of America (“United States”), represented by John Berryhill, Ph.d., Esq., United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <ola.com> (“Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 20, 2025. On May 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On the same day, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 22, 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 23, 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 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the initial due date for Response was June 15, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on June 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu, Sally M. Abel, and Shwetashree Majumder as panelists in this matter on July 8, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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.

On July 15, 2025, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing to the Center.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a ride-hailing company, headquartered in India. The Complainant provides its services through its Ola application available for download on platforms such as Google PlayStore and Apple App Store.

The Complainant, through its group of companies, is involved in various other sectors of activities, such as financial services, cloud computing and artificial intelligence.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for or including OLA, such as the following:

- the Indian trademark registration number 3013303 for OLA (word), registered on July 20, 2015, for goods in International class 9;
- the Indian trademark registration number 2278819 for OLA CABS (C-0, M-0, Y-0. K-100) (figurative combined mark), registered on February 7, 2012, for services in International class 39; and
- International trademark registration number 1751568 for OLA (stylized), registered on January 30, 2023, for goods and services in International classes 9, 12, 16, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 42.

The Complainant asserts it owns domain names comprising the mark OLA, such as <olacabs.com> registered on November 30, 2010, <olakrutrim.com>, <olaelectric.com>, and <olamoney.com>.

The Complainant operates accounts on several social media platforms and has significant number of followers, such as Facebook with approximately 997,000 followers, Instagram with 87,000 followers, X with 283,900 followers.

The Disputed Domain Name was created on June 8, 1995 and the last Whois update, listing the name of the Respondent, was made on March 21, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name was used to redirect to an eBay page, hosted by Knepper Time LLC and selling watches. No reference to the Complainant, or its activities, were made on such webpage.

The Respondent is a physical person located in the United States.

The Respondent was granted the ownership interest in the Disputed Domain Name by the Decision of the Circuit Court of Oregon for the County of Lane dated March 3, 2025, in Case No. 23PB06202 (the "Oregon Court Decision"), as documented by Exhibit I to the Response.

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 the following:

Founded in 2010, the Complainant is part of the Ola Group, which consists of a total of six companies including the Complainant, and which operate under the brand OLA. The Ola Group is one of India's foremost and leading tech-based mobility solutions provider and, as part of its expansion into the global market, the Complainant's services are available in more than 250 cities on three continents, including India, United Kingdom, New Zealand, and Australia.

The Complainant's cab-hailing services promoted under the OLA mark, are present at major travel hubs, such as airports and railway stations.

Ola Electric Mobility Solutions Limited vehicles (part of Ola Group) has the largest integrated and automated electric two-wheeler manufacturing plant in India which spread across over 400 acres. This plant was an outcome of an investment of over USD 500 million by the Ola Group.

Ola Group has also now ventured into the cloud computing space through its vertical Ola Krturim, which, recently, has partnered with technology giant Lenovo to develop India's largest supercomputer.

The Complainant adopted the trademark OLA (which forms part of its tradename, corporate name, and trading style) in 2010 and has used it continuously since. It is submitted that the OLA trademark is arbitrary and fanciful and, accordingly, is inherently distinctive in nature. The Complainant has invested substantial capital, effort and resources and thus, OLA trademark has acquired immense goodwill and reputation. As a consequence, customers and other members of the trade and public associate the OLA trademark exclusively with the Complainant.

The Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark OLA since it wholly incorporates it. Also, the Complainant and the Ola Group of companies are all using OLA-formative domain names. In view of the above, it is submitted that, at the first instance, one can be misled into believing that the Disputed Domain Name belongs to the Complainant and the goods and services offered therein may be associated with or belong to the Complainant.

The Respondent has no legitimate rights or interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, and it is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name since it has no trademark application or registration for "Ola"; and is not operating any website or has presence on any online platform, including social media platforms.

It is submitted that redirection, itself, clearly gives away the lack of legitimate rights of the Respondent in the Disputed Domain Name. Further, the use of the Disputed Domain Name in connection with the eBay page does not feature the trademark OLA, and there is no good or service being offered on the said eBay page by Knepper Time LLC under the trademark OLA. Therefore, it becomes clear that the Respondent has no legitimate rights or interest in using the Disputed Domain Name.

Considering that the Complainant, its business and services are well recognized through their trademark OLA, which has been protected in multiple jurisdictions, the Complainant intended to reach out to the proprietor of the Disputed Domain Name. Investigations by the Complainant/Ola Group in this regard revealed that the Disputed Domain Name had been registered in the name of "Mr. Bron C.F.". After several months of negotiations, Mr. Bron C.F. had agreed to transfer the Disputed Domain Name to the Complainant/Ola Group, according to his email dated February 23, 2024. Further, Mr. Bron C.F. delayed signing the transfer agreement for the Disputed Domain Name, and informed the Complainant on an alleged family dispute, following that, on April 2, 2025, he informed the Complainant that he had to transfer the Disputed Domain Name to the Respondent.

Further, as provided as Annex 13 to Complaint, on March 4, 2025, the Complainant approached the Respondent in order to buy the Disputed Domain Name, subsequent to the negotiations had by the Complainant with Mr. Bron C.F. After several emails, the Respondent informed the Complainant about a court decision awarding him the rights in the Disputed Domain Name, the appeal thereto – which was dismissed, also informing the Complainant that the auction process for the Disputed Domain Name is ongoing, also stressing that "this will most likely be your only opportunity to buy <ola.com>". The Respondent further mentioned that he may be willing to sell the Disputed Domain Name to the Complainant/Ola Group at a price exponentially higher than what was agreed upon between Mr. Bron C.F. and the Complainant/Ola Group.

The Complainant concluded that neither Mr. Bron C.F. nor the Respondent intended to enter into any bona fide transaction regarding the Disputed Domain Name, and the Complainant/Ola Group's efforts to obtain the Disputed Domain Name through commercial means, instead of legal means, were clearly abused by the Respondent in an attempt to receive money from the Complainant unjustly.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no legitimate rights or interests in the Disputed Domain Name since neither Mr. Bron C.F. nor the Respondent have any business under the trademark OLA, or any registrations for the trademark OLA.

The Complainant claims that, until early April 2025, the website under the Disputed Domain Name did not lead to an active page, but to a landing page wherein no website was functional. It is only recently that the Disputed Domain Name has started to redirect viewers to the eBay page of Knepper Time LLC. Therefore, the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name only to redirect consumer traffic towards its e-marketplace on eBay. In doing so, the Respondent is targeting the Complainant's consumers by attempting to affiliate itself with the business of the Complainant/Ola Group under the trademark OLA. The use of the trademark OLA of the Complainant in the Disputed Domain Name clearly heightens the risk of such association.

In light of the correspondence had with Mr. Bron C.F. and the Respondent, the Complainant concludes that the Disputed Domain Name is not being used by the Respondent for any legitimate purposes, but rather for gaining commercial benefit at the behest of the goodwill, reputation and popularity of the Complainant and its business under the trademark OLA. Further, the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to target the consumer base of the Complainant in an effort to divert traffic towards its business would not support a claim of any alleged legitimate interests.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent was acting in bad faith and acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling or otherwise transferring it to the Complainant, who is the owner of the trademark OLA, since the Respondent acquired the Disputed Domain Name from Mr. Bron C.F. and further asked the Complainant to pay a substantially higher price than what the Complainant had negotiated with Mr. Bron C.F. Furthermore, the Respondent threatened that it would sell the Disputed Domain Name to the highest bidder. The value sought by the Respondent was grossly disproportionate to any legitimate domain expenses. The Respondent has demanded a price for the Disputed Domain Name, having no bona fide rights therein, which are not only exorbitantly disproportionate to any legitimate domain expenses, but also very steep. This demand is also shrouded in the threat of the Disputed Domain Name being sold to other potential buyers, should the Complainant/Ola Group not agree to the terms of the Respondent.

The use of Disputed Domain Name, reproducing the Complainant's mark, in connection with the Respondent's eBay page, is made in bad faith because it redirects online traffic intended for the business of the Complainant towards the Respondent's own webpage, in a deliberate attempt to gain commercial benefits, by unduly creating confusion in the mind of consumers.

Further, the mala fide intentions of the Respondent can be gleaned from the fact that the Respondent had approached the Complainant to sell the Disputed Domain Name to it at a significantly higher price. It appears that the Respondent, after gaining knowledge of the goodwill, reputation and recognition of the OLA trademark of the Complainant, had decided to extract commercial gains from the same unjustly. The Complainant believes that the Respondent is not only threatening to sell the Disputed Domain Name to the highest bidder, but is also using the Disputed Domain Name in a manner so as to unjustly reap commercial benefits. The demand for a significantly higher price for transfer of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent in light of the abovementioned threats also demonstrates the Respondent's attempt to compel the Complainant to enter into an unwarranted business arrangement.

Moreover, the circumstances in which the Respondent acquired the Disputed Domain Name, appears in the eyes of the Complainant, to be a clear case of collusion. The timing of the offer of the Respondent made to the Complainant for the sale of the Disputed Domain Name also indicates the bad faith of the Respondent.

Because the Disputed Domain Name was initially registered by a third party, before the Complainant's trademark rights accrued, does not confer any benefit to the Respondent. Irrespective of the original creation date, since the Respondent acquired the Disputed Domain Name after the Complainant's trademark rights accrued, the determination of the present dispute must be done in light of the circumstances at the date the Respondent itself acquired the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, to the extent relevant for this decision, the Respondent contends the following:

The Respondent is involved in speculative investments, inter alia, he is a lifelong dealer in vintage watches.

The Disputed Domain Name was acquired by Mr. C. F., the father of Mr. Bron C.F., in March 3, 2006, from a third party, for the amount of USD 15,000. The Disputed Domain Name was selected as a valuable three-letter abbreviation domain deriving from On-Line Auctions; Mr. C.F. was already the holder of the domain name <onlineauction.com> on which he was providing online auction services.

From time to time, the Respondent loaned Mr. C. F. with money for his business. In time, the Respondent loaned Mr. C. F. developed a friendship relationship.

As the loans increased, the Respondent and Mr. C. F. decided to document such loans and agreed to a promissory note dated January 16, 2017, under which the Respondent issued a loan in the amount of USD 170,000 at 20% interest with the following provision: "Payment of this Note shall be secured by an individual and pledge of URL <OLA.com>", and also "It's agreed the 'who is' Domain record shall reflect [the Respondent] within the registrant domain registration located on the Internet subsequent funding". This document is provided as Exhibit G to Response. The Respondent was supposed to have been established as the registrant for the Disputed Domain Name in the WhoIs at that time. However, Mr. C. F. failed to make such registration at that time, since "as a deal between two friends, this was not considered to be an issue of great importance or urgency at that time".

Mr. C. F. passed away on October 25, 2021, and, was survived by, inter alia, his son, Mr. Bron C. F. (having identical first name and surname with his father), and, to whom, Mr. C. F. gave the access codes to various online accounts and email addresses shortly before passing away.

The Respondent further states that Mr. Bron C. F. was involved in various violations and civil disputes, and very likely, such conduct further motivated him to take an expansive view and misrepresent his authority, using the access codes he had obtained from his deceased father, to falsely negotiate the sale of an asset which he did not own, namely the Disputed Domain Name.

Challenges by creditors to the estate of Mr. C. F. proceeded with a court action before the Circuit Court of the State of Oregon for the County of Lane. The Oregon Court Decision, dated March 3, 2025, ordered, inter alia, that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to the Respondent.

The Respondent believes that the Complainant was aware on the above said court action and has been apparently encouraging Mr. Bron C. F. to tortiously interfere with it. Such allegations are supported by the fact that the Complainant did not provide, in the present proceedings, all the relevant communications with Mr. Bron C. F. and, also, the timing of filing the present UDRP Complaint, shortly after the issuance of the Oregon Court Decision. Furthermore, the Complainant's alleged investigations regarding the holder of the Disputed Domain Name are not provided, in fact the Complainant intentionally avoided to conduct and/or present results of obvious relevant searches available using the Google engine, such as the LinkedIn page of Mr. C. F., or captures available at Archive.org. website.

With regard to the identity or confusing similarity of the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's mark, the Complainant supports it owns rights in OLA for a ridesharing service in India, which did not exist at time Mr. C. F. purchased the Disputed Domain Name, and of which the Respondent has never had a duty of notice.

In fact, according to the public online databases, there are some 351 registered trademarks around the world for "OLA"; in India alone there are nine owners of registered OLA marks; and in the United States, the Mutual Jurisdiction of the current proceeding, there are 15 pending and registered OLA marks, none of these of the Complainant. The Respondent has provided examples of this.

The Respondent has legitimate rights and interests in the Disputed Domain Name since the Respondent is, in a practically literal sense, the heir to Mr. C. F.'s purchase of the Disputed Domain Name in 2006, before the Complainant even existed. While UDRP Panels have generally considered a change in ownership to reset the priority clock, there are notable exceptions where there is a privity, commonality or identity of beneficial interest between successive formal owners.

The Complainant's allegations regarding the use of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent is "completely contradictory nonsense" because there is no requirement one claim trademark rights in a domain name used for legitimate purposes. In fact, Mr. C. F. filed, in July 2019, an application to register "OLA.com" as a trademark for auction services, but did not continue the procedures due to his passing, shortly after this filing.

Also, the Complainant admits and shows the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to drive auction-seeking visitors to his eBay storefront. That is indeed a legitimate business, making a legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Name as a redirect, and the Respondent has a legitimate right to do.

The Disputed Domain Name was legitimate security for a bona fide debt. The Oregon Court Decision ordering the transfer of the Disputed Domain Name to the Respondent, to satisfy that debt, is likewise legitimate. Finally, the Respondent's continued use to promote his online auction storefront is a legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Name and unrelated to the Complainant.

The balance of the Complainant's allegations under legitimate interests arises from Mr. Bron C. F. and the Complainant essentially conspiring to defraud the Respondent, while the estate was still in probate. The Complainant provides no evidence that Mr. Bron C. F. possessed any right to negotiate and sell the Disputed Domain Name and refers generally it conducted "investigations" without using the obvious search tools which would have immediately produced relevant results.

The Respondent acquired the Disputed Domain Name by having loaned Mr. C. F., the previous holder of the Disputed Domain Name, the amount of USD 170,000, in 2017, in exchange for a security interest in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent did not expect to ever become the beneficial owner of the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent became the formal registrant of the Disputed Domain Name by submitting his claim against the estate on the defaulted USD 170,000 loan and breach of the agreement. The Oregon Circuit Court for Lane County ordered the Respondent to become the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name. All these are not related to the Complainant.

Furthermore, it is well established that short acronymic domains have value, precisely because they can stand for many things, absent truly famous marks. AcronymFinder.com lists 49 different definitions of "ola", the "On Line Auction (website)" being the third-listed entry.

The Respondent, reasonably believes that the Complainant encouraged Mr. Bron C. F. to sell the Disputed Domain Name to it, mainly because the Complainant failed to provide proper investigations regarding the actual holder of the Disputed Domain Name, did not provide its relevant communications with Mr. Bron C. F., and has initiated the current proceedings as a "gateway car" after failing to negotiate the transfer of the Disputed Domain Name in a proper commercial way with the Respondent.

The Respondent was not aware of the negotiations between Mr. Bron C. F. and the Complainant, meant to defraud the Respondent. After the Respondent took possession of the Disputed Domain Name pursuant to the Oregon Court Decision, the Respondent received communications from the Complainant and from a third party-domain broker, seeking to advance an offer higher than the Complainant's offer (provided as Exhibit M to Response). Faced with competing multi-million dollar offers from two bidders, the Respondent is perfectly entitled to quote any price, or no price at all, to determine which bidder might go higher. Having legitimately acquired the Disputed Domain Name, and being engaged in legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent can sell it on whatever terms he sees fit.

In its Response, the Respondent's representative requests the redaction of the Respondent's name.

The Respondent requests that the Complaint be denied and that the Complainant be found guilty of involvement in a conspiracy to commit fraud against the Respondent.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

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

A. Procedural Issue 1 – Supplemental Filings

On July 15, 2025, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited Supplemental filing ("Supplemental Filing"), purporting to address issues raised in the Response.

Neither the Rules nor the Supplemental Rules make provision for supplemental filings, except at the request of the Panel (see Rules, paragraph 12). Paragraph 10 of the Rules instructs the Panel to conduct the proceeding “with due expedition”. Therefore, UDRP panels are typically reluctant to countenance delay through additional rounds of pleading and normally accept supplemental filings only to consider material new evidence or provide a fair opportunity to respond to arguments that could not reasonably have been anticipated. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), paragraph 4.6, and cases cited therein.

The Panel notes that the Complainant is represented by counsel, who ostensibly should know the Rules and be aware of the norms concerning thoroughness as requested in the UDRP procedures.

In particular, the Complainant claims that it was not aware of the history of the Disputed Domain Name, including the court procedures held before the Court of Oregon; and that it negotiated with a third party, not the real holder of the Disputed Domain Name, and thus it was not engaged in any malicious conduct. Further, according to the Oregon Court Decision, the Complainant considers that the transfer of ownership of the Disputed Domain Name to the Respondent took place on March 3, 2025, which is after the registration of its OLA mark.

According to Complainant’s own submission as Annex 13 to Complaint, before filing the Complaint, the Complainant was informed, at least by the Respondent on April 16, 2025, with regard to a court decision related to the Disputed Domain Name and therefore the Panel understands that, the Complainant was well aware of a court decision regarding the Disputed Domain Name and that the holder of the Disputed Domain Name was the Respondent.

Further, the fact that the Complainant was not aware of some facts/elements provided in the Response is irrelevant for the analysis of the UDRP elements, particularly since the Complainant’s claims against the Respondent remain generally unchanged.

Accordingly, the Supplemental Filing does not provide relevant information that couldn’t be provided in the Complaint, or otherwise understood by the Panel from the documents already before it. The Panel does not see any exceptional circumstances in this case that necessitate allowing the Supplemental Filing to be admissible. Accordingly, the Supplemental Filing is not admitted.

B. Procedural Issue 2 – Redaction of the Respondent’s name

In its Response, the Respondent’s legal representative requested the redaction of the Respondent’s name, in order to protect his privacy and reputation on the Internet.

Paragraph 4(j) of the UDRP mandates that “[a]ll decisions under this Policy will be published in full over the Internet, except when an Administrative Panel determines in an exceptional case to redact portions of its decision”. This includes party names. By registering a domain name, (per the applicable terms and conditions), domain name registrants subject to a UDRP proceeding are bound by this provision. Publication of party names in UDRP decisions is useful to the overall functioning of the UDRP process which is designed to be transparent in that it helps to explain the panel’s findings, supports jurisprudential consistency, educates others, aims to promote good behavior in the domain name space, and furthermore can be used to illustrate a pattern.

Panels have redacted the respondent’s name from the UDRP decisions, for example when there was clear evidence of identity theft, in the sense that the named respondent has concealed its true identity and adopted a false name, which is similar to the complainant’s own name, its employee, a third innocent party, and this could cause confusion. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#); *Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4746](#); or *Wendel-Participations SE v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2850](#), and cases cited therein.

Regarding the privacy and processing the Respondent's personal data, the Panel notes that, the family name of the Respondent is reflected in his business name which is displayed on the eBay webpage to which the Disputed Domain Name directs; and even more, at the time of drafting the present decision, the Respondent's full name, together with his contact details, is publicly made available in the Whois for the Disputed Domain Name.

However, the Panel decides to accept the Respondent's request for a name redaction .

C. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is undisputed that the Complainant satisfies the first element which involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Disputed Domain Name.

The entirety of the OLA mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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.

The Complainant avers that the Respondent does not hold any trademark registration for OLA, does not conduct any business under "Ola" name, and uses the Disputed Domain Name to redirect to another webpage, which does not amount to a bona fide use.

The Respondent argues it is the successor of the priority right inherited in Mr. C. F.'s 2006 purchase of the Disputed Domain Name, obtaining a security interest in its use in 2017, and that the Disputed Domain Name stands from the common acronym for "On-Line Auctions".

On the other side, and what is undisputed by both parties, the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to promote its products on an online marketplace, where no reference is made to the Complainant.

The use of the Disputed Domain Name, consisting of a three-character term which refers to the former registrant's business activity "On-Line Auctions", prior to any notice of objection from the Complainant, to promote the Respondent's online business, without any reference to the Complainant, can be considered a bona fide offering of goods and services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established.

E. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

While, given the finding under the second element of the Policy, it is strictly unnecessary, in view of the conjunctive requirement of the UDRP, to consider the third element (the use and registration of the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith) the Panel observes that, for similar reasons as set out above, it finds no evidence or circumstances upon which to infer that the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain

Name in bad faith.

In order to satisfy the third element under the Policy, the Complainant must establish the conjunctive requirement that the Respondent both registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. In order to demonstrate, first, that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of its trademark when it registered the Disputed Domain Name, and did so in order to take unfair advantage of the commercial goodwill attaching to that trademark, in other words, “targeting” the Complainant’s trademark rights.

According to the evidence in the file, the Disputed Domain Name was selected for its value as a three-letter acronym, the Respondent obtained a security interest in the Disputed Domain Name in January 2017 based on its contractual relationship with the previous registrant of the Disputed Domain Name, and the formal registration of the Disputed Domain Name in the name of the Respondent took place in March 2025, following a court order.

On the other side, the Complainant has provided some evidence of the notoriety of its mark, but not specifically to various parts of the world. It has, in particular, not provided evidence of the notoriety, registration or use of its OLA mark in the United States, where the Respondent is based.

Even if one would believe that the Respondent would have heard about the Complainant or its trademark, the above facts are more than conclusory that the Respondent was not targeting the Complainant when obtaining interest in or the formal transfer of the Disputed Domain Name in his name.

As a result, the Complainant has not met its burden of demonstrating that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark and in order to target that trademark.

Further, both Parties accuse each other of collusion and misconduct. A panel may decide that the administrative proceeding is not an appropriate forum to evaluate certain contentions of the parties, while it has not been provided the full set of facts (or authority) necessary to make that determination. Past UDRP panels are all clear that the Policy was designed to prevent extortionate or abusive behavior also known as “cybersquatting” and cannot be used to litigate all aspects of the disputes involving domain names. See *Pinnacle Intellectual Property v. World Wide Exports*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1211](#). The Panel will therefore not analyze the rest of Parties’ allegations.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

F. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Respondent’s assertions in relation to the Complainant’s attempt to obtain the Disputed Domain Name in “a conspiracy to commit fraud” against the Respondent shall be treated by this Panel as a Reverse Domain Name Hijacking request, given the limited scope of the UDRP above mentioned.

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16. The Panel finds that, although the Complaint was not successful, there was a reasonable basis for filing the Complaint, also the Complainant was not aware of the full history of the Disputed Domain Name and the private legal documents related thereto. The Complaint was therefore not brought in bad faith and thus not as an abuse of the administrative proceeding.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Marilena Comanescu/
Marilena Comanescu
Presiding Panelist

/Sally M. Abel/
Sally M. Abel
Panelist

/Shwetasree Majumder/
Shwetasree Majumder
Panelist
Date: July 22, 2025