

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

EDMI LIMITED v. Domain Admin, WebDesign HQ

Case No. D2025-2151

1. The Parties

Complainant is EDM I LIMITED, Singapore, represented by Amica Law LLC, Singapore.

Respondent is Domain Admin, WebDesign HQ, Singapore, represented by Cylaw Solutions, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <edmi.com> 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 June 2, 2025. On June 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 2, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 10, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 18, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was July 22, 2025. On July 21, 2025, the Center received a submission from an email address associated with Respondent as confirmed by the Registrar for the disputed domain name after the Complaint was filed, requesting a 14-day extension to move the due date to submit the Response from July 22, 2025, to August 5, 2025. On July 23, Complainant timely filed an objection to Respondent’s 14-day extension request. Taking into account that Respondent’s request was received one day prior to the Response deadline, in accordance with Rules, paragraph 5(e), the Center declined the 14-day extension

request, and in accordance with paragraph 5(b) of the Rules granted the automatic four-day extension on July 22, 2025, extending the due date for the Response until July 26, 2025.

On July 23, 2025, and again on July 24, 2025 the Center received an email from a person identifying himself as Respondent's authorized representative, who requested a further extension of the Response deadline due to being recently retained and a family member's surgery scheduled on the same date as the Response deadline. On July 25, 2025, the Center noted the July 24 email from Respondent's representative regarding a personal family emergency and taking into account such circumstances the Center granted an extension of the Response due date to August 5, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on August 3, 2025. Respondent also sent email communications to the Center on June 11, 2025, July 21-24, 2025, and October 13, 2025.

On August 11, 2025, Complainant filed with the Center a request for leave "to file a brief supplemental statement to clarify key points and correct factual misrepresentations made in the Response". Respondent objected to Complainant's request.

On September 3, 2025, pursuant to Respondent's request to have the dispute decided by a three-member Panel, the Center appointed David Andrew Allison and Gerald M. Levine as Panelists and Scott R. Austin as Chair. 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 September 19, 2025, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1, which permitted Complainant to submit its requested supplemental filing by September 24, 2025, permitted Respondent to provide any comments on Complainant's supplemental filing by September 29, 2025, and extended the Panel's decision deadline to October 9, 2025, which was further extended for exceptional circumstances to October 15, 2025. On September 24, 2025, a Supplemental Filing was received from Complainant. On September 29, 2025, a Supplemental Filing was received from Respondent.

4. Factual Background

Headquartered in Singapore, Complainant is a Singapore public company limited by shares and a subsidiary of Osaki Electric Co., Ltd group, a leading Japanese metering solutions provider and part of a group of companies that design, develop, and manufacture energy meters and smart metering systems for the utility industry. Originally founded in Queensland, Australia as Electronic Design and Manufacturing Queensland, Complainant changed its corporate name in 1981 to Electronic Design and Manufacturing International and since that time has provided its products and services under a trademark consisting of the four letter acronym of its corporate name, EDM I (the "EDMI Mark"). Complainant uses the domain name <edmi-meters.com> to access its official website to provide information on Complainant's products tailored for the energy and smart metering sector.

Complainant holds a number of EDM I and EDM I-formative trademark registrations, shown on copies submitted in the annexes to the Complaint, including the following

1. Australia Registration No. 1497694, EDM I, registered June 21, 2012, for a range of electronic utility meters and related software support services in International Classes 9 and 42;
2. New Zealand Registration No. 960808, EDM I, registered December 21, 2012, for a range of electronic utility meters and related software support services in International Classes 9 and 42; and
3. UK Registration No. UK00004079313,  EDM I, registered October 18, 2024, for a range of electronic utility meters and related software support services in International Class 9.

The Registrar reports that the Disputed Domain Name was created on September 12, 2020, and is registered in the registrant name of "Domain Admin" and in the registrant organization of WebDesign HQ Pte. Ltd. a private limited company incorporated in Singapore with Unique Entity Number 201922813G,

headquartered in Singapore. The Response, however, further identifies the registrant as Mr. Aishwin, an Indian resident, and the registrant organization, WebDesignHQ “incorporated in Singapore by Mr. Aishwin”, which the Response refers to collectively as “the Respondent”. From the Response, it appears that the Respondent company is established as a vehicle for Mr. Aishwin’s investing in domain names, including specifically the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name was originally created on February 11, 1996. Respondent, who has traded in a large number of domain names, acquired the Disputed Domain Name “due to its inherent value as a pronounceable four-Letter (4L) domain name” as the winning bidder during a public expired domain name auction on September 12, 2020. The Disputed Domain Name redirects to the website operated by Respondent which lists the domain name for sale, “https://www.onlinebusiness.com/buy/edmi.com”, and is generally considered an inactive website as there is no active content or functionality beyond the sales pitch and a “purchase inquiry form” providing contact information for purchase.

According to the parties respective email evidence submitted in annexes to the Complaint and the Response and accounts of negotiations for Complainant’s attempt to purchase the Disputed Domain Name from Respondent, on or around May 26, 2022, Complainant first approached Respondent to purchase the Disputed Domain Name by sending a message to Respondent through the purchase Inquiry form noted above.

Respondent states that “Mr. Aishwin from Web Design HQ responded to the Complainant via email and corresponded with the Complainant on the matter thereafter, including on the sale of the <edmi.com> domain to the Complainant”. Complainant provides email evidence that the correspondence continued at least through November 2022 to purchase the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent claims that Complainant omits additional emails in November and thereafter in which a purchase price was agreed to and Respondent initiated escrow procedures for the payment, but Complainant subsequently found excuses not to continue based on “third party platforms”, “procedural issues”, and “budget cuts” before the escrow and sale was cancelled as shown in Respondent’s documents dated January 2023.

Complainant had no further correspondence with Respondent until it sent a demand letter to Respondent on February 24, 2025 that Respondent cease its unauthorized use of Complainant’s EDM Mark in the Disputed Domain Name and “Transfer the Unauthorized Domain Name to our client for the sum of USD 5,000”, and included a threat to file an UDRP action against Respondent if Respondent failed to agree to its terms within 7 days. Respondent declined to accept the terms of the demand letter and this UDRP proceeding ensued.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to Complainant’s registered EDM Mark as it incorporates the Mark in its entirety; WebDesign HQ Pte. Ltd. is a private limited company incorporated in Singapore with Unique Entity Number 201922813G, headquartered in what appears to be a shared commercial office space housing multiple entities, some of which include Global WebSoft Pte. Ltd., Incorp Pte. Ltd., Data Bird Pte. Ltd., among others.

WebDesignHQ is not associated with the Complainant in any way; Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way and is not known or authorized to use the EDM name or mark; that Complainant’s registered EDM Mark is highly unique and distinct from other marks as it is a fabricated term with no dictionary meaning and that the EDM Mark is displayed on Respondent’s website. Complainant further claims that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. According to Complainant, Respondent has not used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a legitimate use, nor is there evidence of any use or preparation to use it for a bona fide offering of goods.

Also, according to Complainant, Respondent has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. Complainant also contends that Respondent targeted Complainant and its EDMI Mark in registering the Disputed Domain Name and therefore Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Finally, Complainant argues that by incorporating Complainant's identical registered trademark in its entirety for the Disputed Domain Name (e.g., the second-level domain), Respondent directly targeted Complainant and its established trademark rights for Respondent's financial gain through selling the disputed domain at a highly inflated price.

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Respondent contends that it has rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name because the Disputed Domain Name was originally registered by a US-based third-party, Electronic Data Management International (EDMI), in 1996; that on the expiration of the Disputed Domain Name in 2020, it was only acquired by the Respondent as a short four-letter pronounceable domain name for investment purposes, which is inherently legitimate; that registration of a domain name consisting of an abbreviated pronounceable word which also could serve as a person's name because Respondent has a good faith belief that the domain name's value derives from its common qualities rather than its specific trademark value, and use of the domain name consistent with such good faith belief would establish a legitimate interest;

That Respondent has been a domain name investor since 2012 and maintains a portfolio of hundreds of domain names, including over 200 4-letter domains. The Respondent acquired the 4-letter short pronounceable Domain Name <edmi.com> "as a professional domainer, and to him the disputed Domain Name is stock-in-trade".

Respondent contends that EDMI is not uniquely associated with the Complainant, because numerous businesses use it independently, which widespread usage and the generic nature of the term demonstrate that the Respondent had ample legitimate reason to invest in domain name <edmi.com>, especially as part of a broader domain portfolio including other acronyms and first-name domains; "Complainant is relatively unknown" and provides sworn evidence that it had never heard of Complainant or its marks at any time prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain Name and it has not targeted Complainant. Respondent contends that it uses the Registrant Organization solely as a business convenience and is located exclusively in India, has only visited Singapore one time in his life.

Respondent contends that it did not register the Disputed Domain Name with Complainant's purported trademark in mind or with the intent to sell to Complainant, to disrupt Complainant's business, or to confuse consumers seeking to find Complainant's website. Respondent contends it purchased the Disputed Domain Name at the GoDaddy auction on September 12, 2020, because it was a domain name that appeared to be publicly available, a short, four-letter pronounceable domain name for investment purposes, brandable and inherently valuable that anyone was entitled to register. Respondent argues that "[T]here is simply no evidence whatsoever to support the complainant's limited contention that the Domain Name was registered because of the Complainant in 2020". Nowhere in the Complaint does Complainant show that Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name for any purpose relating to the goods or services for which Complainant claims to trade. Respondent argues that it did not engage in bad faith registration or use of the Disputed Domain Name, and that it registered the Disputed Domain Name due to its attractiveness as a brandable short four-letter pronounceable domain name. Finally, Respondent contends Complainant's conduct shows a classic case of "reverse domain name hijacking" where Complainant, after failed attempts to purchase the Disputed Domain Name, filed the UDRP complaint as a "Plan B" option.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The *onus* is on Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent from the terms of the Policy that Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer a domain name. As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof under the Policy is often expressed as the “balance of the probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence” standard. Under this standard, an asserting party needs to establish that it is more likely than not that the claimed fact is true. See, WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.2.

Thus, for Complainant to succeed it must prove within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

1. The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
2. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
3. The Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will deal with each of these requirements in turn.

A. Preliminary Matter: Complainant’s Unsolicited Supplemental Filing

As a preliminary matter, the Panel notes that Complainant filed with the Center a request for leave “to file a brief supplemental statement to clarify key points and correct factual misrepresentations made in the Response”. Respondent objected to Complainant’s request. No provision in the Policy, the Rules or the Supplemental Rules authorizes supplemental filings by either a complainant or a respondent without leave from the Panel. Paragraph 12 of the Rules provides that the Panel may request, in its sole discretion, further statements or documents from either of the parties. The Panel notes that the Rules and relevant UDRP panel decisions demonstrate a decided preference for single submissions by the parties absent exceptional circumstances. See *Rollerblade, Inc. v. CBNO and Ray Redican Jr.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0427](#).

The multitude of facts submitted by both parties, at times conflicting, makes for a finely balanced case. This has required extensive and careful review of the materials submitted by each member of the Panel, which although it has resulted in an extended amount of time to complete the review necessary reach its decision, unanimously, the time devoted to the care and treatment of each party’s arguments and unique facts in support of their position is warranted. Given these circumstances the Panel has decided to issue Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1, which permitted Complainant to submit its requested supplemental filing and permitted Respondent to provide any comments on Complainant’s supplemental filing. The Panel further notes that it appears the substance of Complainant’s arguments here relate to the sale price of the Disputed Domain Name and would require the Panel to make a determination whether a particular price during negotiations between a willing buyer and willing seller should be used to determine bad faith. The Panel considers such analysis in this case beyond its province, unwise, and unnecessary given the more useful and less problematic factors present here that are more than sufficient for the Panel to reach its decision. One prior UDRP panel has held where an investor in domain names legitimately registers a domain name which appreciates in value, it is reasonable to expect the registrant to seek the full price it believes to be achievable for the sale of that name, specifically where respondent made no approach to the complainant and quoted the price in question in response to an enquiry from the complainant. See *Costa Crociere S.P.A. v. Yoshiki Okada*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1632](#); see also *OMIS Group S.p.A. v. mediaWorld Advertising International FZE*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2581](#). From the record it has been made

clear that Complainant initiated contact with Respondent for purchase of the Disputed Domain Name and its identity was not kept hidden from Respondent during negotiations. Noticeably absent from the Supplemental Filing, given this second opportunity to raise it, is any evidence to support Complainant's assertions of targeting, or actual knowledge of Complainant's EDMI Mark.

Complainant's Supplemental Filing does provide some benefit to the Panel. The clarifications provided by Complainant and Respondent in their respective supplemental filings are helpful to the Panel in reaching its decision and, therefore, in the exercise of its discretion pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel has accepted the filings timely received pursuant the procedural order and take them into account.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

To prove this element, Complainant must first establish that there is a trademark or service mark in which it has rights. Ownership of a nationally registered trademark constitutes prima facie evidence that the complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Complainant claims trademark rights in the EDMI Mark for a range of electronic utility meter products and related software support services in Australia, New Zealand and the UK trademark registrations for the EDMI Mark referenced above in Section 4, for which sufficient evidence has been submitted in the form of electronic copies of a valid and subsisting certificate of registration in the name of Complainant, although the Panel was required to use its power for limited research of public records to ensure the registrations in Australia and New Zealand had been renewed and were still in effect.¹

Complainant has demonstrated, therefore, that it has rights in the EDMI Mark. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#).

With Complainant's rights in the EDMI Mark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's EDMI Mark. It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement and that the 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 Panel has considered a side-by-side comparison between the Disputed Domain Name and Complainant's EDMI Mark and finds the EDMI Mark is incorporated in its entirety and identical to the Disputed Domain Name, except for the addition of the Top-Level Domain ".com", which is irrelevant in determining whether the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar. See, *Research in Motion Limited v Thamer Ahmed Alfarshooti*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1146](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name confusingly similar to the EDMI Mark in which Complainant has rights and Complainant has thus satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, Complainant has the burden of establishing that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. It is established through prior UDRP decisions under the Policy that it is sufficient for Complainant to make a prima facie showing that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name in order to place the burden of rebuttal on Respondent.; See *Champion Innovations, Ltd. v. Udo Dussling (45FHH)*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1094](#).

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. This may include visiting the website linked to the disputed domain name in order to obtain more information about the respondent or its use of the domain name or accessing trademark registration databases. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.8. See e.g., *Humble Bundle, Inc. v. Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0914](#); *Creative NetVentures, Inc. v. Webheads*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1655](#).

It is clear from the record there is no pre-existing business relationship here between Respondent and Complainant. Complainant has also asserted that it has granted no license or other authorization to Respondent to use the EDM I Mark. Complainant submits that Respondent is not using the Disputed Domain Name for a legitimate use. Respondent argues, however, that it has equitable interests in the Disputed Domain Name, and that it made legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Name for resale as a short, brandable pronounceable term on its for sale site.

Often, in cases where a complainant has a registered mark and appears to have filed the UDRP complaint because it lost a bid for the disputed domain name containing its mark, the case becomes a matter of fine balancing of conflicting evidence to determine which side of the scales the preponderance of evidence falls. Complainant here has given the Panel assertions and speculation but without sufficient evidence to balance. Asserting without evidence that Respondent has no legitimate interests because Complainant has a trademark and Respondent's portfolio contains a domain name that is the same is not enough for this Panel to find Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant's EDM I Mark and targeted Complainant when it purchased the four letter Disputed Domain Name at auction. Although targeting is possible based on these facts, it is not probable or even more likely than not, and in reality it is sheer speculation until and unless supported by sufficient evidence to show it is probable that Respondent had Complainant's EDM I Mark in mind when it purchased the Disputed Domain Name. That level of evidence has not been shown by Complainant here.

In contrast, Respondent's evidence, including a declaration by its owner signed under oath with notarization to verify his signature under the laws of his country, shows that Respondent is running a domain name investment business offering brandable domain names for sale, which business model has been recognized by prior UDRP panels as capable of establishing rights or legitimate interests under the Policy, provided the domain name was not registered to profit from and exploit a complainant's trademark. See, e.g., *Metro Sportswear Limited (trading as Canada Goose) v. Vertical Axis Inc. and Canadagoose.com c/o Whois Identity Shield*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0754](#); and *Bacchus Gate Corporation d/b/a International Wine Accessories v. CKV and Port Media, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0321](#). See also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), relevant decisions collected under Sections 2.1 and 2.10. Section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) provides, "panels have accepted that aggregating and holding domain names (usually for resale) consisting of acronyms, dictionary words, or common phrases can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the UDRP". Section 2.10 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) clarifies that such business in domain names can include common words and phrases so long as the intended use is not to trade off third-party trademark rights.

Respondent's evidence also shows that its "pronounceable four letter (4L) brandable domain business", described by Respondent as the sort of domain name business where it had to be on the lookout for memorable domain names to buy, develop, and resell at high prices because startup businesses are in the market for memorable domain names and would be legitimately attracted to a name like the Disputed Domain Name for its intrinsic value as a four letter short and memorable brand for businesses, which pronounceable four letter terms may be very limited in availability in today's market.

Complainant has provided no evidence to support Complainant or its mark as "well-known" or widely recognized by media or consumers such that the Panel could reasonably conclude Respondent had actual knowledge or even reasonably should have known of Complainant. The financial documents relied on by Complainant and incorporated into its complaint adduce no information about itself or the volume of its business and in which markets. For this information it refers the Panel to websites created by Osaki Electric Co Ltd, Complainant's corporate parent, who, we are told, acquired the Complainant at an earlier date. When the Panel visits these websites, we find there is no reference at all to Complainant.

Accordingly, Respondent has demonstrated that it has rights and legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and Complainant has failed to meet its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given the Panel's finding on the issue of rights and legitimate interests, it is unnecessary to consider the issue of bad faith registration and use. However, the Panel considered the issue and in the view of the Panel, Complainant has failed to establish on the balance of probabilities that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Any such finding would require not only that Respondent knew (or should be taken to have known) of a relevant trademark in which Complainant had rights, but also that it registered the Disputed Domain Name with the intention of benefitting unfairly from the goodwill attaching to those rights.

First, Respondent acquired <edmi.com> from a dropped domain name platform in September 2020. Respondent shows that it had previously been registered to a company whose name, different than Complainant's name, also worked with that four letter acronym and abandoned it allowing it to return to the general pool for the first to register it.

Next, although Complainant boldly asserts that its mark is "inherently distinctive and strongly associated with the Complainant's goods and services", there is sparse evidence of that, such as the type suggested in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sec. 1.3. Complainant states further that its mark "is fanciful, unique, and carries no dictionary definition. Consumers and industry stakeholders universally recognize 'EDMI' exclusively as the Complainant's proprietary brand". Respondent's rebuttal to these assertions demonstrates clearly with persuasive search results that "Edmi" is used in the market by multiple businesses besides Complainant and is also used as a personal name.

Respondent has plausibly denied that it knew of Complainant when Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name. In addition to the sworn, notarized declaration by Respondent denying such knowledge, there is no evidence that Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant or its EDMi Mark and it is clear from the record that factors such as Complainant's lack of a significant presence in India where Respondent is exclusively located, copies of registrations of the EDMi Mark submitted from jurisdictions remote from India after renewal dates without showing the registrations had been renewed, and Respondent's evidence that the four letter acronym at issue here is not in exclusive use by Complainant as a mark, but used by many other corporate entities around the world, all support Respondent's lack of actual knowledge of Complainant and weigh against such knowledge and against Complainant's assertion that Respondent targeted Complainant or Complainant's EDMi Mark in bad faith.

Finally, the Panel considers that Respondent was at liberty to register the Disputed Domain Name as a short, pronounceable four letter brandable term. Given the decisions of prior UDRP panels upholding business models for domain name aggregation and resale similar to Respondent's as legitimate under the Policy, the Panel finds Respondent has not used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith in acquiring the Disputed Domain Name and offering it for resale as part of Respondent's brandable domain names aggregation business, especially considering that there is no evidence here of Respondent using PPC links to Complainant or its competitors or any other pretextual or illegitimate means to profit from Complainant's trademark rights. See, e.g., *Kubota Corporation v. Media Matrix LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3397](#)

Complainant has failed to meet its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Respondent argues that Complainant brought this case in bad faith, as "Plan B" solely to obtain the Disputed Domain Name without buying it, after its attempts at purchase failed because the purchase price was too high.

Prior UDRP panels have held the circumstances present here to represent a clear example of a "Plan B" case, a stratagem described in many UDRP cases as "a highly improper purpose" that has often contributed to findings of RDNH., see, e.g., *Charter Communications, Inc., Charter Communications Holding Company,*

LLC and Charter Communications Operating LLC v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Sheri K Corwin, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0040](#); *Jiggle LLC v. CHAD WRIGHT*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3608](#).

To summarize briefly, even though the Disputed Domain Name and Complainant's registered mark are identical, the Panel finds Complainant should never have brought this case without sufficient evidence in support of its claims and there are no "controverted facts that Complainant may not have been aware of". However, it is surprising to the Panel that Complainant has provided no independent evidence of its reputation in the market, but would have us accept that it was a major contributor to the success of its Japanese parent. Given the salient facts: 1) that Complainant approached and initiated purchase negotiations with Respondent without any assertion of statutory rights, and over a period of several months after the inevitable haggling by both parties, a number appeared to have been reached, yet the purchase never closed; 2) Complainant has submitted no proof of any awareness by Respondent of Complainant's trademark rights; 3) Complainant after walking away from the deal returned several years later to demand its preferred low price under threat of UDRP action and unappeased, commences a UDRP action claiming cybersquatting. The Panel also gives weight to Respondent's declaration that he had no knowledge of Complainant or its EDMI Mark at the time he acquired the Disputed Domain Name. Under these circumstances the Panel finds Reverse Domain Name Hijacking given the Complainant was not justified in bringing this Complaint based on a reasonable belief that it had a plausible legal basis.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Scott R. Austin/

Scott R. Austin

Presiding Panelist

/Gerald M. Levine/

Gerald M. Levine

Panelist

/David Andrew Allison/

David Andrew Allison

Panelist

Date: October 15, 2025