

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ADS Holding LLC v. TCM 2021

Case No. D2025-4165

1. The Parties

Complainant is ADS Holding LLC, United Arab Emirates, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

Respondent is TCM 2021, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <adss.finance> (hereinafter “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 10, 2025. On October 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On October 14, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 14, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 17, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 9, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on November 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on November 14, 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

Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of ADS Holding LLC, a financial services holding company headquartered in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. ADSS is the core operating entity of Complainant's business, founded in 2011 under the name ADS Securities LLC. Complainant operates in the fields of multi-asset trading, brokerage, wealth management, and investment services. It promotes itself as one of the leading brokerage and financial services providers in the Middle East.

In May 2011, Complainant had daily trading volumes of approximately USD 2 billion and was recognized as the "Fastest Newcomer" at the Middle East Forex Awards.

In 2018, Complainant rebranded itself as ADSS. Since then, Complainant and its subsidiaries have added operations in Abu Dhabi, London, and Hong Kong.

Complainant owns registrations in several jurisdictions for the trademark ADSS (hereinafter sometimes the "Mark"), including:

- European Union Registration No. 010317154 (registered February 21, 2012)
- European Union Registration No. 018168726 (registered May 22, 2020)
- United Kingdom Registration No. UK00910317154 (registered February 21, 2012)
- United Kingdom Registration No. UK00003452185 (registered March 20, 2020)

Complainant uses <adss.com> to host its primary website, although it also owns related domain names including: <adss.broker>; <adss.fund>; <adss.forex>; <adss.news>.

Complainant has received numerous awards including: "Best Forex Broker Middle East", "Best Forex Trading Innovation" and "Most Trusted Forex Broker Middle East" at the 2021 Global Forex Awards.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on January 30, 2025. It resolves to an active website that displays colorful graphics and sliding pages that encourage visitors to "Trade Now" by logging in or opening an account and "Trade global financial Markets [...] TRADE WITH THE BEST [...] Forex, Stocks, Commodities, Indices" etc.

In July 2025, Complainant sent three cease-and-desist letters to Respondent's privacy service but did not receive a response to any of them.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

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 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the 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 identical to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

The Disputed Domain Name is used to offer commercial services in relation to forex, stocks, commodities and cryptocurrencies, the exact same services offered by Complainant under the Mark. Nothing on the website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves disclaims an affiliation with Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent is impersonating Complainant with a website that implies affiliation with Complainant. Respondent is vested with no rights or legitimate interests by engaging in this deceptive behavior. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The term "adss" has no descriptive or generic meaning beyond its function as Complainant's Mark, and certainly Respondent has not come forward to suggest it has any particular meaning to it outside of Complainant's Mark. Complainant has submitted ample evidence that its Mark is well known in the financial services field. Respondent is obviously focused on this field, as evidenced by the selection of the Top-Level Domain ".finance" and, of course, by the

content of the associated website. The Panel finds that balance of evidence supports finding that Respondent was aware of and targeted Complainant when it registered the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel also finds that Respondent is intentionally using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith “to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.” Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

The Panel finds that 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 <adss.finance> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: November 26, 2025