

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

elasticsearch B.V. v. Faheel Kamran

Case No. D2025-3594

1. The Parties

The Complainant is elasticsearch B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Quinn IP Law, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Faheel Kamran, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 5, 2025. On September 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 8, 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 service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 9, 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 15, 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 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Fabrice Bircker as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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 company incorporated in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the). It provides an online platform notably for search-powered solutions, observability and cybersecurity.

According to uncontested elements in the case file, as of April 2025, the Complainant's platform has been downloaded more than 4.5 billion times. Besides, the Complainant has also directly licensed its search solutions under its ELASTIC and ELASTICSEARCH trademarks to around 20,000 commercial enterprises and government customers in approximately 175 countries.

In this respect, the Complainant owns, among many others, the following trademarks registrations:

ELASTIC, United States Trademark Registration No. 6263801, with first use in commerce dating March 11, 2015, filed on August 2, 2019, registered on February 9, 2021, and designating products and services of classes 9 and 42,

 elastic International Trademark Registration No. 1317586, filed and registered on July 21, 2016, notably designating, inter alia, Australia, the European Union, India, Israel, and the Russian Federation, and protecting products and services of classes 9 and 42.

The Complainant's online presence is notably ensured through the <elastic.co> domain name that was registered on July 20, 2010, and that resolves to its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 23, 2024.

It redirects to the Complainant's website.

Very little is known about the Respondent, except that based on the information disclosed by the Registrar, he is apparently located in the United States of America.

Before filing the Complaint, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent through the Registrar, but in vain.

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 its ELASTIC trademark, because the latter is recognizable within it.

Then, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, in particular because:

- the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as it is using it to present willfully copied website content of the Complainant that is

subject to copyright protection to deceive the public that the Respondent is associated or affiliated with the Complainant,

- the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name,
- the Respondent is not affiliated with or licensed by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith, notably because:

- the Respondent's did not respond to the cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant,
- when registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent concealed its identity and contact details through a privacy service,
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to capitalize on the goodwill and marketplace recognition associated with the Complainant and to prevent the latter from being able to register the disputed domain name,
- the Complainant's trademarks are famous, well known, and distinctive. Besides, a mere Google search would have revealed them,
- the Respondent actively misrepresents an affiliation and association with the Complainant, presenting a copy of its copyrighted website content and falsely purporting to be the Complainant,
- at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant has been using its famous and well-known trademarks worldwide for over 10 years,
- the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of conduct of abusive domain name registrations,
- the Respondent purposefully registered the disputed domain name to redirect traffic to the disputed domain name from the Complainant's legitimate website,
- the Respondent registered and has been using the disputed domain name for a fraudulent and potentially criminal enterprise for commercial gain or for the prospect of achieving the same directly or indirectly. The public has been and is likely to be confused, misled, and deceived as to the source of the disputed domain name and is likely to be misdirected away from the Complainant when, in fact, the public is actually searching for the latter.

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

The entirety of the ELASTIC 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.

Indeed, although the addition of other term (here, “registrations”) 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 because the ELASTIC trademark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Regarding the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) in the disputed domain name, it is well established that a gTLD is generally disregarded in the assessment of a domain name for the purpose of determining identity or confusingly similarity. [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.

In the present case, the Complainant has not given its consent for the Respondent to use its ELASTIC trademark in a domain name registration or in any other manner.

Besides, there is nothing in the record of the case likely to indicate that the Respondent may be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant’s own website. This situation necessarily gives the impression that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant.

Indeed, the disputed domain name, in as far it reproduces the ELASTIC trademark plus the “registrations” element, might be perceived as connected with an online space where the Complainant’s customers can access or connect to the services provided by the latter.

In this context, in the Panel’s view, the disputed domain name, noting the manner in which it is used, is likely to confuse and mislead the Internet users into believing that said disputed domain name is owned or controlled by the Complainant, whereas this is not the case. Such illegitimate use of the disputed domain cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Registration in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with the Complainant's ELASTIC trademark,
- the use of this trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by more than 15 years,
- previous panels have already considered the ELASTIC trademark known on the market (e.g., *elasticsearch B.V. v. INSEED Chad, INSEED*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2400](#) or *elasticsearch B.V. v. Michael Nava*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4001](#)),
- the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's own website,
- the Respondent concealed his identity when registering the disputed domain name,
- the Respondent has not put forward any argument intended to establish his good faith.

In view of these elements, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark in mind, that is to say in bad faith.

Use in Bad Faith

First, the disputed domain name is used to redirect to the Complainant's website.

Besides, as mentioned in section 6B. above, it results from the composition of the disputed domain name coupled with its use that it might be perceived as related to an online space where the Complainant's customers can access or connect to the services provided by the latter.

Furthermore, the Panel has found¹ that no less than 10 email server records are configured with the disputed domain name.

In such a context, this Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent, who has a clear absence of rights on the disputed domain name, is in a position to send emails unduly impersonating the Complainant.

As a consequence, the Respondent is not only retaining control over the redirection of the disputed domain name by redirecting it to the Complainant's website, but he is using it in a way that represents a threat hanging over the head of the Complainant.

In addition, the Respondent has failed to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use, and he has also concealed his identity when registering the disputed domain name.

Given the context of this case, these elements constitute further evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

¹ It is well accepted that the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, enable a panel to undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it considers such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8).

At last, the Complainant has established that a previous panel has already found the Respondent engaged in cybersquatting (see *Redis Inc. v. Faheel Kamran*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2160](#)).

As a consequence, this case also falls within the scope of provision 4b(ii) of the Policy, namely the Respondent has “registered the [disputed] domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, [and has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct”.

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 <elasticregistrations.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrice Bircker/

Fabrice Bircker

Sole Panelist

Date: October 30, 2025