

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dell Inc. v. Mulalo Masisi, Pen-It Solutions
Case No. D2025-4190

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dell Inc., United States of America, represented by Adams & Adams Attorneys, South Africa.

The Respondent is Mulalo Masisi, Pen-It Solutions, South Africa.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <delltechnologies.africa> is registered with Host Africa (Pty.) Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 13, 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 15, 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 (PEN-IT SOLUTIONS) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 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 amended Complaint on the same date.

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 October 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 18, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on October 29, 2025. The Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with the panel appointment November 19, 2025.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on November 21, 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 an American technology company that develops, sells, repairs and supports personal computers and related products and services. The Complainant was founded in 1984, and now employs more than 100,000 people across 199 offices globally.

The Complainant trades under its trademarks DELL and DELL TECHNOLOGIES, and has widely registered these trademarks, including South Africa Registration No. 1990/05911, South Africa Registration No. 1997/09699 in respect of the trademark DELL and South Africa Registration No. 2016/355596 in respect of the DELL TECHNOLOGIES trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 20, 2025, and redirected to the Complainant's South African website at <dellonline.co.za>. To the date this Decision was issued, the disputed domain name redirects to an inactive site.

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 Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, never having received permission from the Complainant to use its DELL or DELL TECHNOLOGIES trademarks in connection with the registration of a domain name, or otherwise.

The Complainant states that it has "no control over the manner in which the disputed domain name is used or where it will be directed in future".

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. Nevertheless, in an informal communication on October 29, 2025, the Respondent referred that "[the disputed domain name] has been unlocked for transfer and deleted from our system".

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Complainant's DELL TECHNOLOGIES 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.

It has been well-established by prior decisions under the Policy that the gTLD indicators are not to be taken into account when comparing a disputed domain name with a trademark when considering confusing similarity between the domain name and the trademark. [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

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.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel considers it implausible that the disputed domain name was adopted without the Complainant's trademarks in mind, and the Respondent's subsequent use of the disputed domain name seems to confirm this. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

It is well-established in prior decisions under the Policy that the use of a disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's website constitutes use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. This was, clearly, the situation in the circumstances of the present case, and the Panel so finds. The Respondent, by retaining control of the disputed domain name creates a real or implied threat hanging over the head of the Complainant.

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 <delltechnologies.africa> be transferred to the Complainant.

/George R. F. Souter/

George R. F. Souter

Sole Panelist

Date: December 5, 2025