

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SEEK Limited v. 杨信 (Xin Yang)

Case No. D2025-4824

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SEEK Limited, Australia, represented by King & Wood Mallesons, Australia.

The Respondent is 杨信 (Xin Yang), China, represented by 北京茹苑知识产权代理有限公司, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <seekpass.com> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 20, 2025. On November 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 21, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 in English on November 26, 2025.

On November 21, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On November 26, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent objected to the Complainant's request and requested that Chinese be the language of the proceeding in the Response.

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 in Chinese and English 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. On December 8, 2025, the Respondent requested a four-day extension under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, and the Response due date was extended to December 20, 2025. The Response was filed in Chinese with the Center on December 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on January 12, 2026. 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 January 15, 2026, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1 pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules (the "Procedural Order"), noting particularly the Complainant's assertion that the Respondent did not acquire the disputed domain name until July 2024 at the earliest, and noting the Respondent's claim that the disputed domain name was first registered on July 29, 2018 and acquired by the Respondent through legitimate commercial channels, without specifying its exact acquisition date. In the Procedural Order, the Panel required: (a) the Complainant to submit, by January 20, 2026, evidence supporting its asserted acquisition date of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, and (b) the Respondent to submit, by the same date, the precise acquisition date together with supporting documentary evidence. The Procedural Order also invited both Parties to comment on any such submission by the other Party by January 25, 2026.

In response to the Procedural Order, the Complainant made a submission with supporting evidence on January 20, 2026 (the "Supplementary Submission"). The Respondent did not comply with the Procedural Order and did not provide the acquisition date of the disputed domain name or any supporting evidence. However, the Respondent did comment on the Complainant's Supplementary Submission on January 24, 2026 (the "Respondent's Comments on the Supplementary Submission").

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company incorporated in Australia in 1997. Since late 1997, the Complainant has operated online advertising platforms, including the employment marketplace available at "www.seek.com.au". The Complainant has extensive business operations, is listed on the Australian Stock Exchange and has a market capitalization of more than AUD 9.9 billion (dated October 27, 2025). The Complainant has developed a substantial reputation in the SEEK marks through longstanding and extensive use in connection with employment, advertising, technology, and related services in the Asia-Pacific region. One of the Complainant's offerings is SEEK PASS, a credential management, authentication, and verification service operated by its wholly owned subsidiary, SEEK Pass Pty Limited. The SEEK PASS service originated as "Certsy", first launched in 2016, and the Complainant publicly announced the rebranding as SEEK PASS in March 2024, with the transition completed in May 2024 and operations migrated to the website at the official domain name <seekpass.co> in July 2024. The SEEK PASS service is currently offered via this website and a related mobile application, providing digital credential storage, verification, and related services for job seekers and employers.

The Complainant owns an international trademark portfolio for the SEEK and SEEK PASS marks, including but not limited to the following registered trademarks: Australian Trademark Registration Number 2425600 for the word mark SEEK PASS, registered on February 5, 2024 in Classes 9, 35, 42, and 45; Australian Trademark Registration Number 2425601 for the logo mark SEEK PASS, registered on February 5, 2024 in Classes 9, 35, 42, and 45; and Hong Kong, China Trademark Registration Number 306613317 for the logo mark SEEK PASS, registered since July 16, 2024 in Classes 9, 35, 42, and 45.

The Respondent is 杨信 (Xin Yang), an individual based in Fuzhou City, China.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 29, 2018. According to the Respondent's statements in the Response, the disputed domain name was acquired by the Respondent at a later, undisclosed date, through legitimate commercial channels.

According to the evidence on record, the disputed domain name currently directs to a website, displaying "seekpass.com" in the header and in two other places and purporting to "raise awareness of public health news and share real-time information". This website primarily directs users to media websites, or functions as a search engine, with any health content presented as automated news feeds. The website does not appear to have an obvious commercial or business purpose, and no responsible entity is identified. Further, according to the evidence on record, around June 11, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a website essentially offering it for sale at USD 300,000.

Finally, based on the evidence provided by the Complainant and confirmed by the Respondent in its Response, prior communications in English between the Parties show that on February 15, 2025, the Complainant's agent offered to purchase the disputed domain name for AUD 20,000, which the Respondent declined, but indicated a willingness to consider a price of USD 200,000. The Parties subsequently exchanged a series of emails in English between February 15 and February 27, 2025 concerning the purchase price, proposed escrow arrangements, deadlines, and meeting proposals, with the Respondent repeatedly asserting that a binding agreement had been reached at USD 200,000. The Complainant's agent consistently indicated that it could not meet the proposed price (indicating a maximum price of USD 50,000) and declined the offer, and on March 3, 2025, the Respondent sent a further email attempting to "formally confirm" the alleged agreement, asserting that the Complainant had abandoned its commitment while indicating the disputed domain name was being transferred to the Respondent's registrar.

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 disputed domain name is identical to its SEEK PASS trademark, of which it is the owner. The Complainant argues that it is a well-known Australian company with a substantial reputation in the SEEK brand, including the SEEK PASS service, which was launched in 2016 as Certsy and rebranded in early 2024. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's SEEK PASS trademark in its entirety, and there are no additional elements in the disputed domain name that distinguish it from the Complainant's marks. The Complainant argues that searches indicate that the disputed domain name was acquired by the Respondent no earlier than July 2024, after the registration and public launch of the Complainant's SEEK PASS trademark, reinforcing the temporal link between the Complainant's rights and the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that its trademark rights are established through multiple registered marks in Australia and in various Asia-Pacific jurisdictions, and the identical nature of the disputed domain name to the SEEK PASS trademark supports the first limb of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Additionally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and does not provide any goods or services under or by reference to the SEEK PASS mark. Both the website currently resolving under the disputed domain name and the briefly used alternative website are unrelated to SEEK PASS and have no bona fide commercial purpose. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, including operating a site that merely redirects traffic or advertises the disputed domain name for sale, does not constitute fair use or legitimate noncommercial use. Accordingly, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name after the priority date of the Complainant's SEEK PASS trademarks, used privacy protection to conceal its identity, and operated websites that misappropriate the Complainant's brand.

The Complainant argues that communications with the Complainant's agent demonstrate that the Respondent sought to sell the disputed domain name at an exorbitant price well above any out-of-pocket costs, and made repeated assertions that a sales agreement had been reached, including implicit threats, despite no agreement being concluded. The Complainant argues that the combination of registering an identical disputed domain name after the Complainant's rights were established, lacking any legitimate use, and attempting to profit unduly from the sales of the disputed domain name supports a finding of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy.

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.

Under the first element, the Respondent acknowledges that the disputed domain name is similar to the Complainant's SEEK PASS mark but argues that the evidence provided by the Complainant merely establishes the Complainant's standing under the first limb of the UDRP, without predetermining success on the remaining elements.

Further, under the second element, the Respondent asserts rights or legitimate interests based on the Respondent's bona fide, noncommercial use of the disputed domain name for a public-interest website focused on health news, rare diseases awareness, and public information aggregation from major platforms. The Respondent describes the site as displaying clear disclaimers of any commercial or trademark association, offering free AI tools and volunteer/donation recruitment for rare diseases, and operating continuously in bilingual mode to broaden public reach without monetization, advertising, or intent to mislead. The Respondent particularly explains its choice for "seekpass" as descriptively meaning "seek and transmit valuable information", aligning with the site's mission, and notes that pre-launch checks of major trademark databases revealed no relevant registrations for SEEK PASS, particularly in the areas of health, public welfare, and Internet. The Respondent has set up mail exchange ("MX") records on the disputed domain name and has displayed an email address related to the disputed domain name on the bottom of the website for communicating with the public. Occasionally, the Respondent receives emails from the Internet users who thought they had sent the emails to the Complainant, and the Respondent always replies with the correct email address.

Additionally, under the third element, the Respondent denies bad faith in registration and use, stating that the disputed domain name was first registered in 2018 before any Complainant rights arose and was lawfully acquired by the Respondent via a legitimate channel, based on its generic value ("seek" + "pass") rather than targeting the unknown Complainant's mark, which lacks reputation, especially in China, where the Respondent operates and has no registration. The Respondent argues that no obligation exists for a Chinese acquirer of a generic Top-Level Domain to search global trademarks, and the Respondent's public-interest use matches the term's descriptive meaning without commercial gain, confusion, or harm. The Respondent likewise denies bad faith use, given the site's consistent, noncommercial public-interest operation, which descriptively matches the disputed domain name's meaning, includes explicit anti-confusion disclaimers, and causes no disruption or reputational harm to the Complainant, together with standard use of Whois privacy services as a legitimate privacy measure rather than an attempt at concealment.

Finally, the Respondent accuses the Complainant of reverse domain name hijacking, alleging that the Complainant initiated contact under false pretenses (via an intermediary posing as a basketball club and linked to the Complainant), pursued low-price acquisition attempts despite the Respondent's initial refusal to sell and later market-based pricing (influenced by generic domain name trends like "DeepSeek" AI hype), then filed this Complaint upon purchase failure, using the resulting negotiation emails as evidence.

The Parties' statements in response to the Procedural Order are discussed in Section 6.2 below.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. First Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English, and the Complainant requests that English be the language of the proceeding for several reasons, including that the disputed domain name consists entirely of English words and corresponds to the Complainant's English-language SEEK PASS trademark; that the associated website content, including complex text, is predominantly in English; that the contact email addresses displayed on the website are in English; and that the Respondent conducted all pre-Complaint correspondence with the Complainant in English. The Complainant submits that these circumstances demonstrate the Respondent's familiarity with English and its intention to target an English-speaking audience, notwithstanding the Respondent's apparent nationality or place of residence, and that the Respondent is capable of understanding and responding to the Complaint in English. The Complainant further notes that it and its representatives are based in Australia, and contends that requiring translation of the Complaint into Chinese would be onerous and unduly burdensome.

The Respondent requested that the language of the proceeding be Chinese, claiming that under the Rules, paragraph 11(a), the language must follow the Registration Agreement priority principle, with the Registration Agreement being entirely in Chinese and containing no supplementary provision for English, such that the Complainant's arguments based on the English composition of the disputed domain name, English website content, or the Respondent's familiarity with English from pre-Complaint commercial discussions cannot override this statutory standard since domain name/website language choices concern commercial operations while procedural language ensures equal participation in legal proceedings requiring precise legal terminology beyond casual communication, and requiring the Respondent, being a Chinese native speaker, to defend in its non-native language English would deprive the Respondent of full rights to present defenses and respond to evidence in violation of established fairness principles.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, and giving particular weight to the fact that the pre-Complaint communications between the Parties were all conducted in English and that the website at the disputed domain name has the English version, the Panel determines, pursuant to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, that the language of the proceeding shall be English. The Panel notes, however, that it is fully proficient in both Chinese and English and that it has reviewed and considered all submissions and evidence filed by the Respondent in Chinese in reaching this Decision. No translation of any submission or evidence by either Party is required, and the Panel has taken into account all submissions and evidence filed by either Party in either language, and the Respondent's right to present its case and respond to the Complaint has therefore been fully preserved in accordance with principles of equality and fairness, see also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.5.1.

6.2. Second Preliminary Issue: Date of Registration of the Disputed Domain Name

As noted by the Panel in the Procedural Order, a key issue that must be determined before reaching a decision on the merits of this proceeding is the date on which the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name, as this date is critical in assessing both the Respondent's potential bad faith and any allegation of reverse domain name hijacking by the Complainant. Against this background, the Panel issued the Procedural Order as described above.

In its Supplementary Submission, the Complainant essentially argues that the Respondent did not acquire the disputed domain name until at the earliest July 2024 based on historical Whois records, DNS history and IP address history. The Complainant submitted the entire Whois history covering the period from July 29, 2018 to January 18. The Complainant points out, supported by evidence, that the publicly available Whois records for this period do not identify the registrant(s) due to the use of privacy masking and proxy services, making it factually impossible to determine from the Whois history the exact date of the Respondent's acquisition. Nevertheless, the Complainant establishes that the records do show that during that period, the disputed domain name was registered with multiple registrars, associated with different privacy and proxy services, and listed at various registrant locations over time. The DNS and IP address histories further indicate several changes in name servers and IP addresses, including a new IP address on July 30, 2024, and during the period from October 6 to October 24, 2024, the disputed domain name was "not resolvable". The Complainant additionally argues that the disputed domain name expired on or around July 2024 and was briefly offered for sale before being re-registered in September 2024. Moreover, the Complainant's evidence of the historical screenshots captured by Wayback Machine shows that there were no websites captured from the registration date of the disputed domain name in 2018 until July 30, 2024. All of the above thereby supports the conclusion that the Respondent's acquisition of the disputed domain name occurred no earlier than July 2024.

The Panel notes that the Respondent did not comply with the Procedural Order and appears to have refused to disclose the acquisition date of the disputed domain name, although expressly requested to do so by the Panel. This information lies solely within the Respondent's knowledge and cannot be independently established by the Complainant, particularly in light of the consistent use of privacy or proxy services in connection with the disputed domain name.

Nevertheless, the Respondent did file Comments on the Supplementary Submission, in which the Respondent essentially argues: (i) under UDRP, paragraph 4(a) the Complainant bears the full burden of proof for all three elements and has failed to provide direct, highly probable evidence of bad-faith registration and use, relying instead on speculative inferences; (ii) the Domain Tools report provided by the Complainant lacks probative value because it expressly disclaims accuracy and merely aggregates public DNS and Whois data, while changes in registrars, name servers, or IP addresses can result from legitimate reasons including renewal of domain names, replacement of agent service, server migration, and technical optimization and do not prove a transfer of ownership; (iii) the Complainant's request that the Respondent produce earlier transfer records improperly expands the Respondent's evidentiary burden beyond UDRP, paragraph 4(a)(ii), which requires only proof of rights or legitimate interests prior to the Complaint which has already been satisfied; (iv) the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name through a third party agent, and did not preserve relevant acquisition records due to objective factors including registrar system update and replacement of equipment. It was not that the Respondent deliberately concealed or evaded information, particularly where the Complainant's own evidence suggests that during the period of July 13, 2021 to August 8, 2021, the registrant's address was in Anhui, China, which means the Respondent may have owned the disputed domain name as early as 2021 (the Panel notes that the Respondent is located in Fujian Province, China according to the Registrar's verification and the Response); and (v) the use of privacy services during domain name registration is a common practice for domain name registrants to protect their personal information and registration security. This service complies with ICANN regulations and domain industry practices and is not used to conceal infringement or evade legal responsibility. Such services are provided by reputable ICANN-accredited registrars, demonstrating the legality and compliance of the privacy services themselves. Therefore, using the privacy services cannot, by itself, support a finding of bad faith.

The Panel disagrees with the Respondent's arguments and refers to section 3.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), reflecting the consistent views of panels applying the Policy: "[...] the date on which the current registrant acquired the domain name is the date a panel will consider in assessing bad faith. This holds true for single domain name acquisitions as well as for portfolio acquisitions. In cases where the domain name registration is masked by a privacy or proxy service and the complainant credibly alleges that a relevant change in registration has occurred, it would be incumbent on the respondent to provide satisfactory evidence of an unbroken chain of registration; respondent failure to do so has led panels to infer an attempt to conceal the true underlying registrant following a change in the relevant registration. Such an attempt may in certain cases form part of a broader scenario whereby application of UDRP paragraph 4(b)(iv), read in light of paragraph 4(a)(ii), can support an inference of bad faith registration for the respondent to rebut."

The Panel therefore finds that, given the consistent use of privacy and proxy services in connection with the disputed domain name since its original registration, and in light of the evidence and credible submissions presented by the Complainant, it is incumbent upon the Respondent to provide satisfactory evidence of an unbroken chain of registration, as only the Respondent is in a position to do so. The Panel notes that the Respondent failed to provide such evidence, in spite of the explicit Procedural Order requiring it to do so. Accordingly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's submissions and, on the balance of probabilities, determines that the Respondent likely acquired the disputed domain name on a date after July 2024, and infers from the Respondent's conduct a conscious attempt to conceal the true underlying registrant information, see section 3.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

6.3. Substantive Issues

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 the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 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. In its Response, the Respondent essentially argued that it has rights or legitimate interests by operating the disputed domain name for a bona fide, noncommercial public-interest website focused on health news and rare disease awareness, aggregating information from major platforms, providing free AI tools, recruiting volunteers and donations, and offering email services for communicating with the public. The Respondent emphasizes that the site is bilingual, noncommercial, contains disclaimers regarding trademark affiliation, and explains its choice for the allegedly descriptive “seekpass” as “seek and transmit valuable information”, with pre-launch checks allegedly conducted by the Respondent indicating no relevant trademark conflicts.

The Panel does not accept the arguments advanced by the Respondent. The Panel considers that the Respondent has not established, demonstrated, or made plausible use of the purported descriptive meaning of the term “seekpass”, which instead appears to be a clear reference to the Complainant’s identical SEEK PASS marks. The Panel also finds that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or the SEEK PASS marks, and that the Respondent has provided no convincing explanation for the inclusion of this distinctive term in the disputed domain name. Further, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the website does not establish rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Respondent has provided no corroborating evidence of genuine public-interest activity through the website, and the few rotating news articles on public health appear outdated (all from July and August 2025) according to the Respondent’s evidence of the screenshot of the website captured in December 2025. Further, the information regarding the recruitment of volunteers or donations appears to be a mere assertion. Therefore, the Panel is convinced that on balance, the website constitutes merely token use, consciously intended to avoid the Policy’s application. This conclusion is further reinforced by the prior use of the disputed domain name around June 11, 2025, of which the Complainant provided evidence, when it was used to host a website offering the disputed domain name for sale for USD 300,000.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name appears to have caused the public confusion because the Annex to the Response shows that the Respondent received at least two email communications in April 2025 from individuals believing that they had sent the emails to the Complainant. The Respondent replied to those individuals that “the website for SEEKPASS is www.seekpass.co”.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. 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 notes that the Respondent, who is entirely unaffiliated with the Complainant, registered the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant’s intensively used SEEK PASS trademarks. Having regard to the Panel’s determination of the date of acquisition of the disputed domain name under Section 6.2 above, the Panel finds that even a basic Internet or trademark search at the time of such acquisition by the Respondent, which is indeed the relevant date for assessing bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.9), would have readily revealed the Complainant’s prior rights in the SEEK PASS marks. The Panel is also not persuaded by the Respondent’s assertion that it was unaware of the Complainant’s mark or that the mark lacks reputation, whether in China or elsewhere. Given the global nature of the Internet, the Policy does not require a complainant’s trademark to be registered or well known in the respondent’s jurisdiction, nor does it excuse a respondent from responsibility where a domain name that is identical to a prior mark is acquired without any credible explanation (see particularly section 3.2.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)). In the present case, having regard to the identical nature of the disputed domain

name, its acquisition in close temporal proximity to the Complainant's public rebranding to SEEK PASS, and the absence of any credible alternative meaning or bona fide use demonstrated by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew, or should have known, of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time it acquired the disputed domain name. Further, as discussed under Section 6.2 above, the Panel infers that the Respondent is deliberately concealing information regarding the date of its acquisition of the disputed domain name, which supports a finding of bad faith registration. In these circumstances, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As to the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the evidence on record shows that the Respondent briefly connected it to a website offering the disputed domain name for sale for a price of USD 300,000 around June 11, 2025, and was also engaged in pre-purchase communications with the Complainant's agent demanding a minimum price of USD 200,000, likely exceeding any out-of-pocket costs connected to the disputed domain name. On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attempt to sell it to the Complainant, the owner of the identical SEEK PASS mark, or to the Complainant's competitors, in order to obtain an unjustified financial benefit. The Panel finds that this constitutes direct evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. The current use of the disputed domain name for what appears to be a sham website does not change the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith.

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

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Where the Complaint succeeds on the merits, a claim of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH") does not require detailed examination, and the Respondent's mere allegation of RDNH warrants no further assessment.

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 <seekpass.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: February 4, 2026