

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DigiCert Inc. v. 6281218250324 Utomo, ILOGO
Case No. D2025-3480

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DigiCert Inc., United States of America, represented by Taylor Wessing LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is 6281218250324 Utomo, ILOGO, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <digicertindonesia.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 29, 2025. On September 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 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 (“Address information redacted for privacy”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 2, 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 September 5, 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 September 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 7, 2025.

The Center appointed James Wang as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 was founded in 2003. The Complainant claims to have partnered with Microsoft in 2007 to develop the industry's first multi-domain certificate, and in 2013 built the first Certificate Transparency Log accepted by Google.

The Complainant also claims to be a market leader in Internet of Things security, digital identification of drones and Public Key Infrastructure management.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations worldwide incorporating DIGICERT, including but not limited to:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1051226, registered on August 3, 2010; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1357093, registered on June 7, 2017.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <digicert.com>, which was registered on December 2, 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 3, 2020. The disputed domain name resolved to a website that prominently displays the Complainant's DIGICERT trademark and reproduced the identical award image and wording found on the Complainant's website.

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 trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove 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 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

The Complainant has provided evidence that the Complainant and its affiliates own numerous trademark registrations worldwide incorporating DIGICERT.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Therefore, the TLD “.com” shall be disregarded under the confusing similarity test in this case. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant’s DIGICERT trademark. As the DIGICERT trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. The addition of the geographical term “indonesia” into the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

According to the Complaint, the Complainant has no connection with the Respondent or the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant’s intellectual property. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used or is preparing to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or has made or is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, and the Respondent failed to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant’s DIGICERT trademark and the fact that the disputed domain name resolved to a website that prominently displays the Complainant’s DIGICERT trademark and reproduced the identical award image and wording found on the Complainant’s website, it would be inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its DIGICERT trademark at the time of the registration. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Panel further believes that the way of using the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent was seeking to cause confusion and has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <digicertindonesia.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/James Wang/

James Wang

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2025