

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TriOptima AB v. Tony Glazier
Case No. D2025-4389

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TriOptima AB, Sweden, represented by Ashurst LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Tony Glazier, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <trioptima-group.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 October 24, 2025. On October 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 28, 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 (Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 28, 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 October 30, 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 October 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Brigitte Joppich as the sole panelist in this matter on November 28, 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 Swedish investment firm that was founded in 2000. It is part of the OSTTRA Group, a 50/50 joint venture between CME Group and S&P Global launched in September 2021. The Group provides a broad range of end-to-end financial investment services and currently employs around 1,350 post-trade professionals across eight offices worldwide. The Complainant's activities received considerable press coverage, and it has received numerous industry awards, either independently or as part of the OSTTRA Group.

The Complainant is the registered owner of several trademarks for TRIOPTIMA, including international trademark registration no. 1363203, registered on June 8, 2017, which is protected for services in class 36 (the "TRIOPTIMA Mark"). The Complainant also owns the domain name <trioptima.com>, which directs Internet users to the OSTTRA website where the services provided under the TRIOPTIMA Mark are explained.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 19, 2025, and has not yet been used in connection with an active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

With regard to the three elements specified in the Policy, paragraph 4(a), the Complainant contends that each of the three conditions is met in the present case.

(i) The disputed domain name is identical to and confusingly similar with the TRIOPTIMA Mark. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name features the TRIOPTIMA Mark in its entirety, pairing the word "trioptima" with the word "group", separated by a hyphen. It further argues that the phrase "group" offers no distinctiveness beyond the first element of the disputed domain name and is a common term included in URLs within the industry to indicate connection, association or relationship.

(ii) The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It contends that the Respondent was never granted permission to use the TRIOPTIMA Mark or any name confusingly similar to it in the disputed domain name, that there is no evidence that the Respondent holds any rights or valid interest in the disputed domain name, that the Respondent does not hold any unregistered rights in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has not made, or attempted to make, any genuine or bona fide use of the disputed domain name.

(iii) Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. It states that the TRIOPTIMA Mark is well-known and that registering a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known trademark creates a presumption of bad faith, that the Respondent's use of a privacy provider to register the disputed domain name creates a presumption of bad faith, and that it is a registrant's responsibility to carry out clearance searches to ensure that a domain name does not infringe any third-party trademark rights. Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with the intention of attracting, for commercial gain, internet users to a website to be hosted at the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the TRIOPTIMA Mark as to the source, affiliation, services, or endorsement of the website. In this context, the Complainant also points out that that financial and investment services is a sector which is often subject to phishing attempts, hoaxes and scams, which cause significant harm to businesses and individuals, distrust and harm to the sector, and significant harm to service providers if imitated. It states that, given that the TRIOPTIMA Mark is well-known and distinctive, there is no clear reason for a third party to register the disputed domain name except to carry out phishing, hoax, or scam activities in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, paragraph 4(a), the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and
- (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 disputed domain name includes the TRIOPTIMA Mark in its entirety, alongside the additional term "group", which is separated by a hyphen. The TRIOPTIMA Mark is clearly recognisable within the disputed domain name, which is therefore confusingly similar to the TRIOPTIMA Mark under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant satisfied the requirements of the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Even though the Policy requires the complainant to prove that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, it is the consensus view among UDRP panels that a complainant has to make only a prima facie case to fulfill the requirements of the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii). As a result, once a prima facie case is made, the burden of coming forward with evidence of the respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name will then shift to the respondent.

The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the burden of production has been shifted to the Respondent.

The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to come forward with any allegations or evidence demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Based on the evidence before the Panel and as the disputed domain name is not actively used, the Panel cannot find any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent either.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name under the Policy, paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the TRIOPTIMA Mark. The TRIOPTIMA Mark is highly distinctive, and the Complainant has provided evidence that its activities have received considerable press coverage. Moreover, the Complainant has received numerous industry awards. In the Panel's view, these circumstances, coupled with the fact that the Complainant is part of a group of companies (operating under the name OSTTRA), as reflected by the addition of the term "group" in the disputed domain name, make it inconceivable that the

Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's TRIOPTIMA Mark and thus in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

As the Respondent is not actively using the disputed domain name, the Panel must decide whether such passive holding constitutes use in bad faith under the Policy. The mere absence of an active use of a domain name does not necessarily prevent the finding of bad faith. The Panel must consider all the circumstances of the case to determine whether a respondent is acting in bad faith. Examples of circumstances that may indicate bad faith use include the existence of a well-known trademark, the lack of a response to the complaint, concealment of identity, as well as the impossibility of conceiving any good faith use of a domain name (cf. *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#); *Jupiters Limited v. Aaron Hall*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0574](#); *Ladbroke Group Plc v. Sonoma International LDC*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0131](#)).

In the present case, the Respondent did not reply to the Complaint and has therefore not provided any argument in support of an actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, at the second level, the disputed domain name fully incorporates the Complainant's highly distinctive TRIOPTIMA Mark, and the disputed domain name gives the impression that it was deliberately registered to target the Complainant. The facts of this case do not support any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not infringe the Complainant's trademark rights. The Panel is therefore convinced that, even though the disputed domain name is not being actively used at the moment, the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain name meets the bad faith use requirement.

Consequently, the Complainant has also satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(i), and the Rules, paragraph 15, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <trioptima-group.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Brigitte Joppich/

Brigitte Joppich

Sole Panelist

Date: December 4, 2025