

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SEEH Finance and Investments SA v. Janashford Associates,
Janashford Associates
Case No. D2025-2855

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SEEH Finance and Investments SA, Switzerland, represented by Etude Fontanet & Associés, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Janashford Associates, Janashford Associates, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <seehfinanceinvestments.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 18, 2025. On July 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 23, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 23, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 28, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Torsten Bettinger as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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 a Swiss private company registered in Geneva since June 29, 2006.

According to the commercial register, the company's purpose is "the acquisition, management and administration of all shareholdings, particularly at international level, in all industrial, commercial and financial companies".

The Complainant is the holder of several domain names incorporating its company name, including: <seehfinance.ch>, registered on October 3, 2017 and <seehfinanceinvestment-ch.com>, transferred to the Complainant on October 25, 2024, following the UDRP decision in *SEEH Finance and Investments SA v. Janna N Sopelnik*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3508](#).

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was subject to a prior proceeding which resulted in the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant, *Seeh Finance and Investments SA v. Andrej Pullenski*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4899](#). The Complainant did not provide any explanation as to how and when it lost control of the disputed domain name.

The Complaint operates its official website at <seehfinance.ch>.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 8, 2025. It resolves to a website that purports to offer banking and investment services under the Complainant's company name, "SEEH FINANCE AND INVESTMENTS SA", which is displayed prominently. The website's imprint further lists the Complainant's business address (street, city, and postal code), differing only in that the street number is shown as "88A" instead of "38A".

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 it is the owner of an unregistered mark corresponding to its company name "SEEH Finance and Investments", which it has used continuously since 2006. The Complainant provided evidence that it constantly used the company name and business identifier in professional correspondence e.g. with banks, real estate professionals, notary publics, payment and risk managers, asset managers, fund administrators, public administration of Geneva and others at least since 2018.

With regard to the requirement of "identity or confusing similarity between the trademark and the domain name" pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant submits that, the disputed domain name is identical to its unregistered mark;

With regard to the Respondent having no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant submitted that the Respondent:

- has not used, nor made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- does not hold any registered trademarks or intellectual property rights in the name “Seeh Finance and Investments”;
- is not commonly known by that name, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use it;
- is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name; instead, his website reproduces the Complainant’s name and offers investment-related services similar to the Complainant’s corporate purpose, without the required Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority (FINMA) license.

Finally, with regard to the disputed domain name having been registered and being used in bad faith, the Complainant argues that, the Respondent:

- uses the Complainant’s name and image for fraudulent purposes;
- a similar case arose in 2022 (*Seeh Finance and Investments SA v. Andrej Pullenski*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4899](#)), in which the disputed domain name <seehfinanceinvestments.com> was ordered to be transferred to the Complainant;
- employed the same false postal address as in the present case;
- these circumstances indicate that the Respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant must prove each of the three following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed 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 disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

The Panel considers that the Complainant has established unregistered trademark and service mark rights in the designation SEEH FINANCE AND INVESTMENTS within the meaning of the Policy, see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3. In the Panel’s assessment, the Complainant has adequately demonstrated that its mark, which mirrors its registered business name, functions as a distinctive identifier of source. The mark is inherently distinctive and has been consistently used in commerce to designate the Complainant’s services. The Complainant has also submitted undisputed evidence showing continuous use of the company name and business identifier since at least 2018, including in professional correspondence with banks, real estate professionals, notaries, payment and risk managers, asset managers, fund administrators, and public authorities in Geneva.

The disputed domain name <seehfinanceinvestments.com> incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety. The only difference between the mark and the disputed domain name is the omission of spaces between the words and the addition of the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD").

It is well established that the removal of spaces or punctuation when a mark is used in a domain name does not prevent a finding of identity or confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Likewise, the addition of a gTLD such as ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the first element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <seehfinanceinvestments.com> is identical to the Complainant's mark SEEH FINANCE AND INVESTMENTS for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

According to the Complainant's unrebutted submissions, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that purports to offer banking and investment services under the Complainant's mark, which is prominently displayed on the site. The imprint even reproduces the Complainant's business address, with the only variation being the substitution of "88A" for "38A" in the street number. This use is clearly commercial in nature and cannot be regarded as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel also finds that such conduct does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. As reflected in section 2.5 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), there can be no legitimate interest in a domain name that is confusingly similar to a third party's mark, particularly where the domain name is used for activities aimed at consumers in the very sector in which the trademark holder operates.

Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. Panels have also consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity—such as impersonation or fraud—can never confer rights or legitimate interests ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1). On the record in this case, the Complainant has provided credible and unrebutted evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant.

For all these reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 finds that the Complainant has established an unregistered trademark right in the mark SEEH FINANCE AND INVESTMENTS.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and was used for a website that purports to offer financial services which are identical to those of the Complainant. The Panel therefore has no doubt that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's rights and with intent to exploit them.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, according to the Complainant's un rebutted submissions the disputed domain name has been used for a website purporting to offer banking and investment services under the Complainant's mark, which is prominently displayed. The imprint on that website even reproduces the Complainant's business address (street, city, and ZIP code), with the only variation being a change of the street number from "38A" to "88A". Such conduct misleads Internet users into believing that the website is operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant, thereby creating a risk of fraud and potential harm to consumers (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4) and therefore falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

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 <seehfinanceinvestments.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Torsten Bettinger/

Torsten Bettinger

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2025