

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DigiDNA Sàrl v. Hasnain Altaf

Case No. D2025-4958

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DigiDNA Sàrl, Switzerland, internally represented.

The Respondent is Hasnain Altaf, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <imazing.org> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 27, 2025. On November 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 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 (Unknown/ Privacy Protected) and contact information in the Complaint. On December 4, 2025, the Center sent to the Complainant a request to amend the Complaint in relation to missing formalities. On December 8, 2025, the Complainant sent an amended Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 10, 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 December 12, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 December 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 5, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 16, 2025. On January 8, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on January 19, 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.

4. Factual Background

According to the Complainant's official website, the Complainant was founded in 2008 in Switzerland, having initially launched the DiskAid tool for transferring files between iPhones and computers, which was later rebranded as IMAZING in 2014.¹

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for IMAZING (Annex 1 to the Complaint):

- Switzerland trademark registration No. 665841, registered on November 6, 2014, renewed, in classes 9 and 42;
- United States of America trademark registration No. 4797427, registered on August 25, 2015, renewed, in classes 9 and 42; and
- International trademark registration No. 1231302, registered on November 6, 2014, renewed, in classes 9 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 27, 2025, and presently does not resolve to an active website. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name at times redirected Internet users to a webpage that mimicked the Complainant's official website, and, at other times, to unrelated commercial websites (such as cryptocurrency price pages), or webpages offering suspicious files download (Annex 4 to the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant, in its succinct complaint, 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 to have used the IMAZING trademark continuously since 2014 in connection with its mobile device management and data transfer software, as well as operating as its official domain name <imazing.com>, being identical to the disputed domain name thereto.

As to the lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant asserts that:

- i. the Respondent is neither known by nor authorized to use the IMAZING name and trademark, having the Complainant never licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it;
- ii. there is no evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, rather having the webpage that resolved from the disputed domain name presented a deceptive imitation of the Complainant's official website;

¹ The Panel visited "www.imazing.com/about" on January 22, 2026, in accordance with its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, according to which panels may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if they would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#)), section 4.8.

- iii. the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name; and
- iv. there is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith given the impersonation of the Complainant; the unauthorized use of the Complainant's content; the deceptive redirection to suspicious websites and the concealing of the Respondent's identity behind a privacy shield.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. In its email communication to the Center of December 16, 2025, the Respondent stated to be willing to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement with the Complainant and requested a temporary suspension of the proceeding to allow the parties to engage in settlement discussions. The Complainant did not request the suspension of the proceeding.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; 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.

The Complainant must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[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. 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.

In that sense, and according to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent who has not been authorized, licensed, or been allowed to use the Complainant's trademark, whether in the disputed domain name, or in any other way.

Also, the lack of evidence as to any trademarks registered by the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name, corroborates the indication of an absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [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

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.

This case presents the following circumstances which indicate under the balance of probabilities bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- a) the composition of the disputed domain name consisting solely of the reproduction of the Complainant's IMAZING trademark;
- b) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website impersonating the Complainant's official website, thus creating a high degree of likelihood of confusion;
- c) the Respondent has not formally responded to this procedure; and
- d) the Respondent's choice to retain a privacy protection service.

The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, its use, and particularly the mimicking of the Complainant's website. In these circumstances, the Panel considers that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to take an unfair advantage of the similarities with the Complainant's IMAZING trademark.

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 <imazing.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Sole Panelist

Date: February 2, 2026