

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Analog Devices, Inc. v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. D2025-5078

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Analog Devices, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by ArentFox Schiff LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <analogdevicesinc.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 5, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 8, 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 December 9, 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 11, 2025.

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 December 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne 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

The Complainant is a corporation in the state of Massachusetts, in the United States. It was founded in 1965 and is a global leader in the design and manufacture of analog, mixed-signal, and digital signal processing (DSP) integrated circuits used in a wide range of electronic equipment and is a leader in semiconductor design.

Since 1965, the Complainant has continuously used various trademarks for or incorporating its ANALOG DEVICES mark in the United States in relation to goods and services in the field of semiconductors and integrated circuits. In particular, it owns United States trademark registration No. 3983055 for ANALOG DEVICES which was registered on June 28, 2011. It also owns the domain name <analog.com> from which it operates a website to promote its business and based on which it operates its corporate email addresses.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 14, 2025, and at the time of filing of the Complaint redirected to the Complainant's website.

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 it owns registered trademark rights in its ANALOG DEVICES mark as set out above and that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates this mark and is therefore confusingly similar to it. It says that the addition of the term "inc" in the disputed domain name which is the commonly used abbreviation for "incorporated" and which is identical to its corporate name, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not made and is not making a legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name which when entered into a user's Internet browser redirects to the Complainant's website (see *Conforama France v. Benjamin Kouassi*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1166](#)). Neither, says the Complainant, is the Respondent using the disputed domain name to make a bona fide offering of goods or services and it also asserts that there is no evidence that the Respondent has any legitimate business relating to or incorporating the mark ANALOG DEVICES, or any legitimate noncommercial interest in the Complainant's ANALOG DEVICES mark. It also says that there is no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademark or service mark rights or registrations that are identical, similar, or in any way related to the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with it and has not received any licence or consent, express or implied, to use the ANALOG DEVICES mark in a domain name or in any other manner. Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has never been known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant says that its ANALOG DEVICES mark is well-known and widely advertised in the United States and other countries around the world and that a simple Internet search would have revealed its mark to the Respondent. It notes that the disputed domain name was registered many years after its trademark registration and says that considering the disputed domain name wholly incorporates its mark and redirects its website, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's ANALOG DEVICES mark at the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, which is virtually identical to the Complainant's registered ANALOG DEVICES mark and its use to redirect to the Complainant's own website is an obvious bad faith attempt to derive commercial or other benefits from the Complainant's ANALOG DEVICES mark. It notes that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name is in breach of the registrant's warranty under paragraph 2 of the Policy. Further, the Complainant submits that there is no conceivable contemplated use of the disputed domain name (which wholly incorporates the Complainant's corporate name and its ANALOG DEVICE mark) that would not be an infringing use by the Respondent.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the term "inc", being the standard abbreviation for incorporated commonly used to refer to a registered company, 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.

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.

The Complainant has submitted that the Respondent has not made and is not making a legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name which, when entered into a user's Internet browser redirects to the Complainant's website. It is well established by previous panels that making a disputed domain name redirect to the Complainant's own website does not confer rights or legitimate interests (see *Conforama*

France v. Benjamin Kouassi, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1166](#)). The Complainant has also submitted that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name to make a bona fide offering of goods or services and that there is no evidence that the Respondent has any legitimate business relating to or incorporating the mark ANALOG DEVICES, or any legitimate noncommercial interest in the Complainant's ANALOG DEVICES mark. The Complainant has also asserted that there is no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademark or service mark rights or registrations that are identical, similar, or in any way related to the disputed domain name. The Complainant has confirmed that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with it and has not received any licence or consent, express or implied, to use the ANALOG DEVICES mark in a domain name, or in any other manner. The Complainant has also submitted that the Respondent has never been known by the disputed domain name.

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

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.

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.

The Complainant's ANALOG DEVICES mark has been used for many years in the United States and its registration long predates the registration of the disputed domain name. In circumstances that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's ANALOG DEVICES mark and at the date of filing redirected to the Complainant's website, it is more than likely that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's mark, business and website at <analog.com> when it registered the disputed domain name in July 2025.

The use of a domain name incorporating a trademark by an unauthorised third party to redirect Internet users to a complainant's (or a competitor's) website is evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4

Re-directing a domain name to a complainant's website amounts to bad faith use insofar as the respondent retains control over the redirection thus creating a real or implied ongoing threat to the complainant. See *Ann Summers Limited v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Mingchun Chen*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0625](#), and *Myspace, Inc. v. Mari Gomez*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1231](#). In this case the Respondent has redirected the disputed domain name which wholly incorporates the Complainant's mark, and which is identical to the Complainant's corporate name, to the Complainant's website. At any time, the Respondent could redirect the disputed domain name to another website, which for example might seek to offer competing goods or services or which could be used illicitly to obtain information from Internet users who are confused and who incorrectly think that they are dealing with the Complainant. The Panel finds that the circumstances of this case therefore amount to conduct fulfilling the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy which is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <analogdevicesinc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alistair Payne/

Alistair Payne

Sole Panelist

Date: February 2, 2026