

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Constant Company LLC v. wang yi
Case No. D2025-2288

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Constant Company LLC c/o Walters Law Group, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is wang yi, Serbia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vultrcloud.ink> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 2025. On June 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 12, 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy services provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 13, 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 June 13, 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 June 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Dawn Osborne as the sole panelist in this matter on July 9, 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 operates in the field of cloud computing and is the owner of the mark VULTR registered as trademark registration no. 4636137 in the United States for cloud computing related services since November 11, 2014.

The Complainant owns and operates the website located at the domain name <vultr.com> and has used it for more than a decade in connection with the provision of website hosting and cloud computing services.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 15, 2025, and it has been used for a site offering competing cloud computing services.

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 that:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior trademark merely adding the term "cloud" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".ink" neither of which prevents said confusing similarity.

The Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it and has not been authorised by the Complainant.

The disputed domain name is being used for a site offering competing cloud computing services to the Complainant. Accordingly, the Respondent's use was not a bona fide offering of services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. It was registration and use in bad faith confusing Internet users for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

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 VULTR trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “cloud” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The addition of a gTLD such as “.ink” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. By offering competing cloud computing services the web site attached to the disputed domain name was confusing. Offering competing services in a confusing manner is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial fair use.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has offered competing cloud computing services to those of the Complainant.

The Panel holds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark, thereby disrupting the Complainant’s business.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <vultrcloud.ink> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dawn Osborne/

Dawn Osborne

Sole Panelist

Date: July 9, 2025