

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AXION EDGE OOD v. Jermain Banks

Case No. D2025-3437

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AXION EDGE OOD, Bulgaria, represented by Kinstellar, s.r.o., Bulgaria.

The Respondent is Jermain Banks, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <edgehounds.com> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 26, 2025. On August 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 27, 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 (PERFECT PRIVACY, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 28, 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 August 29, 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 September 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on September 25, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

According to its website at “www.edgehound.com”, the Complainant offers “AI-Powered Trading & Investing Research for Every Investor” under the mark EDGE HOUND¹.

The Complainant owns the following pending and registered trade marks for EDGE HOUND in classes 9, 35, 36 and 42:

- European Union trade mark No. 019151757, filed on March 5, 2025, registered on August 3, 2025;
- International Registration No. 1856449, filed and registered on March 7, 2025; and
- pending Australian, and United States applications filed under Nos, 2551796, and 79424992 respectively, all on March 7, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2025.

When reviewed by the Panel, the disputed domain name resolved to a website branded “Edge Hounds”. The site was headed “Sports Betting AI Tools Built for Hunters, Not Hopes” and it went on to state: “Outsmart the books with EdgeHounds — your elite toolkit for high-EV betting, live line intel, and savage value detection. We cover NFL, NBA, MLB, NHL, UFC & more...”

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s cease and desist letters sent on July 14, and August 4, 2025.

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.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark 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.

¹The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has visited the Complainant’s website, which is publicly available. The Panel considers this process of verification useful in assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.8.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the letter “s”) 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 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 recognised 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.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and as further discussed in section 6C below, the Panel considers that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name intentionally attempt to attract, confuse and profit from Internet users seeking the Complainant’s goods and/or services. Such use of the disputed domain name is not bona fide.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

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.

The Panel notes the following:

First, the Complainant’s mark is highly distinctive.

Second, the disputed domain name consists of an obvious pluralised version of the Complainant’s mark.

Third, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name some three months after the Complainant applied for a batch of trade marks.

Fourth, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a website that offer similar services to those of the Complainant, namely AI tools for research, albeit that the Respondent appears to target bettors rather than investors.

Fifth, the Respondent has neither responded the Complainant's cease and desist communications, nor appeared in this proceeding, to explain and justify its registration and use of the disputed domain name.

For the above reasons, the Panel considers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <edgehounds.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: October 9, 2025