

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

International Business Machines Corporation v. priyanka k
Case No. D2025-3744

1. The Parties

The Complainant is International Business Machines Corporation (IBM), United States of America ("United States"), represented by IBM, United States.

The Respondent is priyanka k, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ibmtechnologie.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 15, 2025. On September 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 16, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (John Doe) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 17, 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 September 17, 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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Erica Aoki as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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, founded in 1911, is one of the world's largest and most recognizable technology companies. Headquartered in Armonk, New York, United States, IBM operates in more than 170 countries, offering hardware, software, cloud computing, and artificial intelligence solutions under its distinctive IBM trademark.

The Complainant owns and has maintained trademark registrations for IBM in 131 countries worldwide for several decades, covering a broad range of goods and services, including information technology–related products and services; notably, the IBM trademark has been registered in the United States since 1924 (United States Registration No. 4181289 registered on July 31, 2012), with hundreds of additional registrations across multiple jurisdictions and classes.

The trademark IBM is among the world's most valuable and has achieved the status of a well-known trademark under numerous national and international laws.

The Complainant owns and operates the domain name <ibm.com>, registered in 1986, which serves as the primary domain name for IBM's global operations. The website receives millions of visits per month and is a central platform for IBM's commercial and informational activities.

The disputed domain name <ibmtechnologie.com> was registered on December 20, 2024. According to evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name redirected to the Complainant's legitimate country website at <ibm.com/in-en>.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied all three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

First, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its IBM trademark.

The disputed domain name reproduces the IBM trademark in its entirety, followed by the descriptive word "technologie" (the French, German, and Dutch equivalent of "technology") and the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD").

The Complainant asserts that the addition of a descriptive term closely related to its core business reinforces, rather than dispels, the likelihood of confusion.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorized to use its marks, and is not commonly known by any name incorporating "IBM".

The Complainant adds that the disputed domain name was used to redirect visitors to the Complainant's own website, which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Third, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant established its well-known rights in the IBM trademark. Given the fame of the trademark, the Complainant contends that the Respondent could not have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of IBM's trademark.

The use of the domain name to redirect to the Complainant's official website demonstrates an attempt to exploit IBM's goodwill and could mislead users into believing that the disputed domain name was officially affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant.

Such conduct constitutes bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish 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

It is well established that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7).

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the IBM trademark through long-standing use and multiple international registrations dating back to 1924.

The disputed domain name incorporates the IBM trademark in its entirety, with only the addition of the term "technologie" and the ".com" gTLD.

Panels have consistently held that the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, generic or otherwise) to a complainant's trademark does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity where the trademark remains recognizable ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The first element of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests by showing bona fide use, being commonly known by the domain name, or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Once the complainant makes a prima facie showing that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1).

The Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorized to use the IBM trademark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The use of the disputed domain name to redirect visitors to the Complainant's own website cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial use.

The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence to rebut the Complainant's assertions or to establish rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The second element of the Policy is satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

To satisfy the third element, the Complainant must show that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith (Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)).

The IBM trademark has been registered and used globally for over a century and is universally recognized as a famous trademark.

The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name in 2024, incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark along with a descriptive term related to IBM's business, strongly indicates awareness of the Complainant and intent to exploit its reputation.

The use of the dispute domain name to redirect to the Complainant's own official website demonstrates an attempt to create a false impression of legitimacy and to benefit from potential user confusion. Panels have held that a respondent redirecting a domain name to a complainant's website can establish bad faith insofar as the respondent retains control over the redirection thus creating a real or implied ongoing threat to the complainant. ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The third element of the Policy is satisfied.

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 <ibmtechnologie.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Erica Aoki/

Erica Aoki

Sole Panelist

Date: November 4, 2025