

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Legora AB v. Patrik Alfvegren, TeenVoice International Limited
Case No. D2025-4783

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Legora AB, Sweden, represented by Setterwalls Advokatbyrå, Sweden.

The Respondent is Patrik Alfvegren, TeenVoice International Limited, United Kingdom (“UK”).

2. The Disputed Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <legoraai.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 November 18, 2025. On November 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On November 19, 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 (Sophos Evolution Ltd.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 21, 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 November 25, 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 November 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 16, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 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.

On December 22, 2025, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing to the Center.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant Legora AB, a Swedish based company, is an enterprise active in the generative artificial intelligence (“AI”) sector, offering collaborative AI for legal professionals under the trademark LEGORA.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for or including LEGORA, such as the following:

- the International Trademark registration no. 1848876 for LEGORA (word), registered on January 15, 2025, designating numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including the UK, for goods and services in the International Classes 9, 36, 42, 45; and
- the European Union Trademark registration no. 019130424 for LEGORA (word), filed on January 13, 2025, and registered on May 17, 2025, for goods and services in the International Classes 9, 42, and 45.

The Complainant’s primary website is <legora.com> created on March 29, 2022. On its website, the Complainant lists, among its clients, numerous firms based in and/or with offices located in the UK. ¹

The Disputed Domain Name <legoraai.com> was registered on July 17, 2025 and, at the time of filing the Complaint, it resolved to a page providing various articles, under the following upper banner: “Legora AI News – Your Source for AI News”.

At the bottom of the home page, one could read: “Legora AI News™ scans AI related news and reports what is most relevant for its readers. Legora AI News™ is a trademark that is used by Sophos Evolution Ltd, [address redacted] London”, followed by the disclaimer ““Legora AI News” is not affiliated with “Legora AB” or “legora.com””. Also, the disclaimer was featured on the homepage and remained visible when navigating through the various tabs on website at the Disputed Domain Name.

According to the documents provided by the Parties, the disclaimer was posted by the Respondent following the first Cease-and-Desist Letter sent by the Complainant, on September 5, 2025.

The Respondent TeenVoice International Limited is an entity based in the UK.

Prior to commencing the present proceedings, between September 5, 2025 and October 6, 2025, the Parties had an exchange of letters in relation to the Disputed Domain Name.

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.

¹For panel’s authority to undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, section 4.8.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it is one of the leading actors in the field of generative AI; the Disputed Domain Name and the phrase “Legora AI News”, as used by the Respondent on the website at the Disputed Domain Name, are identical or at least confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark registrations and refer to goods and services of the same or a similar kind as those covered by these marks. The absence of the terms “AI” or “News” in the Complainant’s trademarks is immaterial, as these terms are merely descriptive for the services provided by the Respondent and therefore lack distinctiveness.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name mainly due to the following:

- (i) the Respondent is not the registered holder of any trademarks identical or similar to “Legora”;
- (ii) while the Respondent is unknown and privacy-protected (as the Whois data only provides the contact details for the Registrar) no circumstances have provided support that the Respondent has any form of rights or legitimate interest in relation to the Disputed Domain Name;
- (iii) the Complainant has not licensed nor authorized the use of its trademark or trade name to the Respondent; and
- (iv) the exclusive right to the trademark belongs to the party holding the registration, the Respondent holds no such registration for the trademark at issue and therefore has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Also, the Complainant states that the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith due to the main reasons:

- (i) the Complainant’s market position is built on significant goodwill and strong reputation established through continuous investment and high-quality standards within the AI industry, particularly in the legal tech sector. Any unauthorized use risks causing market confusion, diluting the distinctiveness of these marks, and unfairly taking advantage of the Complainant’s reputation and customer trust;
- (ii) should the Respondent have taken minor efforts to research the availability of the name “Legora”, by way of a quick Internet search, it would have disclosed the LEGORA trademark and its extensive use by the Complainant, prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain Name on July 17, 2025. As the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, confusion will be inevitable;
- (iii) the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s LEGORA mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Disputed Domain Name registration post-dates the Complainant’s LEGORA trademark. The Respondent operates in the AI sector and, given the Complainant’s presence in that field under the LEGORA mark, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its mark at the time of registration and use. That inference is reinforced by the explicit statement on the Respondent’s website under the Disputed Domain Name that “Legora AI News is not affiliated with “Legora AB” or “legora.com”” which confirms the Respondent’s awareness of the Complainant and its domain name. The Respondent’s adoption and use of the Disputed Domain Name incorporating the Complainant’s distinctive mark, coupled with such knowledge, supports a finding that the Respondent sought to capitalize on user confusion and initial interest attraction for commercial benefit. The presence of a disclaimer does not cure the confusion created by the Disputed Domain Name itself nor negate the inference of bad-faith intent.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, to the extent relevant for this Decision, the Respondent contends the following:

Whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights:

(i) the Respondent does not dispute that the Complainant owns registered trademarks for LEGORA. However, the Complainant's rights do not extend to the Respondent's activities since the Complainant holds trademark registrations for goods and services in the International Classes 9, 42, 45 and provides goods and services limited to such fields, whereas the Respondent operates an AI news and commentary blog, which falls under International Class 41;

(ii) "Legora AI News" creates a distinct commercial impression comparing to the Complainant's mark LEGORA, since it includes descriptive terms ("AI" and "News") which signals a media outlet and uses distinct branding and presentation;

(iii) the origin of the name is independent since the Respondent selected the name "legoraa" for its Latin meaning: "lego" = "I read" and "ora" = "edge" and, the Respondent further alleges, "this aligns with a news site focused on cutting-edge AI developments".

The Respondent claims it has rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name particularly because:

(i) it has used the Disputed Domain Name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, namely, before the notice of the dispute, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in relation with a functioning AI news website, published 20 articles, invested significant time and resources; operated transparently as a UK company with shareholders and employees;

(ii) there is no requirement to hold a registered trademark since a respondent may establish legitimate interests through use, and the Respondent's use of "Legora AI News" as an unregistered mark is entirely proper;

(iii) the Respondent did not target the Complainant since it had no knowledge of the Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Name, they operate in a different field of activity (news vs. legal tech), does not target the Complainant's customers, does not trade on the Complainant's reputation; and

(iv) as a good-faith measure the Respondent added a disclaimer after receiving the Complainant's first letter.

The Respondent alleges it did not register the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith as, at the time of its registration, the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant or its trademark; the choice of the Disputed Domain Name was based solely on its Latin meaning; and the parties operate in different fields.

Further, the Respondent asserts that the Disputed Domain Name was not used in bad faith particularly because:

(i) it did not register the Disputed Domain Name to sell it and did not offer it for sale, did not contact/block the Complainant, is not a competitor of the Complainant, did not attempt to disrupt the Complainant's business or to attract users for commercial gain;

(ii) the Respondent has no advertising, no revenue, and no commercial exploitation of the Disputed Domain Name;

(iii) there was no attempt to create confusion since the Respondent uses a distinct logo and branding, publishes news not software, added a disclaimer voluntarily, and does not target legal professionals.

The Respondent also makes a request for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. The reasons advanced for this are that the Complainant (a) has disregarded UDRP Principles as the parties operate in entirely different fields; (b) has misrepresented the timeline of the disclaimer; (c) ignored the clear evidence of legitimate use since the Respondent had launched the site, published nearly 40 articles, and invested significant resources before any notice of dispute; (d) made false allegations of targeting and commercial gain and provided no evidence to support such allegations; (e) attempt to stretch trademark rights beyond their scope; and (f) used the UDRP as a pressure tactic, demanding immediate surrender of the Disputed Domain Name and threatened legal action.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities 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 the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Procedural Issue – Supplemental Filings

On December 22, 2025, the Complainant submitted an unsolicited Supplemental filing (“Supplemental Filing”), purporting to address issues raised in the Response.

Neither the Rules nor the Supplemental Rules make provision for supplemental filings, except at the request of the Panel (see Rules, paragraph 12). Paragraph 10 of the Rules instructs the Panel to conduct the proceeding “with due expedition”. Therefore, UDRP panels are typically reluctant to countenance delay through additional rounds of pleading and normally accept supplemental filings only to consider material new evidence or provide a fair opportunity to respond to arguments that could not reasonably have been anticipated. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), paragraph 4.6, and cases cited therein.

The Panel notes that the Complainant is represented by counsel, who ostensibly should know the Rules and be aware of the norms concerning thoroughness as requested in the UDRP procedures.

In particular, the Complainant submits as Supplemental filing a letter received from the Respondent on October 6, 2025, before filing the Complaint on November 18, 2025. Accordingly, the Supplemental Filing does not provide relevant information that couldn’t be provided in the Complaint.

The Panel does not see any exceptional circumstances in this case that necessitate allowing the Supplemental Filing to be admissible. Accordingly, the Supplemental Filing is not admitted.

B. 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Also, the goods and/or services for which the mark is registered or used in commerce, the filing/priority date, date of registration, and date of claimed first use, are not considered relevant to the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.1.2.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

While the addition of other term, here “ai”, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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

C. 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.

The Respondent alleges it adopted the name “legoraai” for the Disputed Domain Name based on its Latin meaning, deriving from “lego” meaning “to read”, and “ora” meaning “edge”, and that this “aligns with a news site focused on cutting-edge AI developments”. The Panel observes various discrepancies, such as that: (i) the first definition for “ora” is “pray”, as per the evidence provided by the Respondent; and that (ii) the association of the words “lego” and “ora” would result in “legoora” and not “legoraai”. The Respondent also refers to “Legora AI News” (which corresponding domain name is not registered) a number of times in the Response, but this is not the same as the Disputed Domain Name, and if the domain name included the word “news” that would lend credibility to the Respondent’s contentions.

Based on the above, the Panel does not find the Respondent’s explanations convincing in choosing the name for the Disputed Domain Name.

Further, the Respondent’s allegations that it was not aware of the Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Name are rather contradictory since on one side the Respondent selected the Disputed Domain Name for a website focused on AI related news and on the other side the Complainant provides AI related services online; and both Parties are located in Europe and are doing business mainly online.

The Respondent also claims unregistered trademark rights in “Legora AI News”; and that, before the notice of the dispute, it has used the Disputed Domain Name in relation with a functioning AI news website, published 20 articles, invested significant time and resources; operated transparently as a UK company with shareholders and employees. The Panel notes that the submitted materials (e.g. screen print of the Respondent’s website, dated December 16, 2025; Annex 3 to the Response) demonstrate that the Respondent’s website published various articles in October 2025, closely following the Complainant’s Cease-and-Desist Letter of September 2025. Furthermore, the website screenprint dated December 16,

2025, indicates that there has been only one further article release since October (on November 10, 2025) by the December 16 date; and the Panel has observed one further publication in December 2025. It would seem to the Panel that if the Respondent was running a real news coordinating site (in particular one that seems to automatically create articles as opposed to manual research and drafting) there would be more articles and press releases on the site. The Panel further notes a discrepancy in the Respondent's submissions regarding the number of articles it has published (20 versus 40).

Except for copies from the website at the Disputed Domain Name, the evidence provided as presence on social media under the name "Legora AI News" lists six followers on LinkedIn, and two followers on Facebook.

With regard to the entity operated by the Respondent, the Respondent provides various excerpts about an entity named "Sophos Evolution Ltd", without providing the potential connection with the Respondent TeenVoice International Limited; such documents are also dated June 2023, which is before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

Therefore, together with the other documents in this case, the Panel does not find such indicia as a bona fide offering of goods and services or genuine noncommercial use of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel also notes the nature of the Disputed Domain Name which reproduces the Complainant's distinctive trademark LEGORA, corresponding tradename and domain name, together with the non-distinctive term "ai", closely related to the Complainant's business in generative AI.

Based on the case file, the Panel finds, on balance, that the Respondent did not register the Disputed Domain Name based on its value as a Latin phrase but rather because of the goodwill inherent in the Complainant's trademark.

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

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with likely knowledge of the Complainant and its LEGORA trademark, tradename and domain name particularly because the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by about six months and is distinctive. The Panel also notes that the Complainant's domain name <legora.com> was registered in 2022. In addition, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name itself, which reproduces the Complainant's mark together with a dictionary term (i.e., "AI") closely related to the Complainant's business further reinforces an inference of bad faith. Lastly, the use of the Disputed Domain Name to provide news related to the AI sector, as detailed in section 6.C above, further supports that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name opportunistically to take advantage of the Complainant's rights in its LEGORA mark.

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.

Particular circumstances panels may take into account in assessing whether the respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith include, inter alia: (i) the nature of the domain name (e.g., a domain name incorporating the complainant's mark plus an additional term such as a descriptive or geographic term, or one that corresponds to the complainant's area of activity or natural zone of expansion), (ii) the content of any website to which the domain name directs, including any changes in such content and the timing thereof, (iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation

for the respondent's choice of the domain name, or (iv) other indicia generally suggesting that the respondent had somehow targeted the complainant.

Given that the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's trademark and tradename together with an additional term that corresponds to the Complainant's area of activity; the Parties are both located in Europe; the Parties operate mostly online (also noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines); the content on the website at the Disputed Domain Name providing AI related news and articles whereas the Complainant provides generative AI services; the Respondent's explanations particularly concerning the Disputed Domain Name's creation; indeed in this Panel's view it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith for the purpose of the Policy.

Before filing the Complaint, and after being notified by the Complainant, the Respondent posted a disclaimer on the website at the Disputed Domain Name. However, where the overall circumstances of a case point to the respondent's bad faith, the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith. In such cases, panels may consider the respondent's use of a disclaimer as an admission by the respondent that users may be confused. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.7.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Respondent requested the Panel to find the Complainant has engaged in Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

Here, the Complaint was successful and was not brought as an abuse of the administrative proceeding.

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 <legoraai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu /

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: January 2, 2026