

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Templum, Inc. v. Sidney Edwiin  
Case No. D2025-5232

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Templum, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Soteria LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Sidney Edwiin, Singapore.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <templum.cc> and <templume.cc> are registered with Dominet (HK) Limited. The disputed domain name <templume.com> is registered with NameMart Pte. Ltd. The disputed domain name <templume.org> is registered with Namemart Limited.<sup>1</sup>

Dominet (HK) Limited, NameMart Pte. Ltd, and Namemart Limited are jointly and collectively referred to below as the “Registrar”.

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 15, 2025. On December 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 18, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 22, 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 in English on December 22, 2025.

On December 22, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <templume.org> is Chinese. On December 22, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

---

<sup>1</sup>Namemart Limited provided information indicating that it recently changed its name from “Domain International Services Limited”.

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 January 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on February 3, 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 financial technology company that provides technology and infrastructure for private markets and alternative asset investing. It builds platforms that connect investors, wealth managers, asset managers, and intermediaries with private market opportunities. It holds multiple trademark registrations, including the following:

- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00801463432 for TEMPLUM, registered on September 27, 2019, specifying goods and services in classes 9, 36, 38, and 42;
- United States trademark registration number 8,009,821 for TEMPLUM, registered on November 4, 2025, with a claim of first use in commerce on September 30, 2017, specifying services in class 42;
- United States trademark registration number 7,649,060 for TEMPLUM ONE, registered on January 14, 2025, with a claim of first use in commerce on October 2, 2023, specifying services in class 36; and
- United States trademark registration number 8,019,447 for TEMPLUM MARKETS, registered on November 11, 2025, with a claim of first use in commerce on February 28, 2019, with a disclaimer of the exclusive right to use “markets” other than in the mark as shown, specifying services in class 36.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant uses the domain name <templuminc.com> in connection with its website, which prominently displays the TEMPLUM mark with a logo in the shape of a letter “T” (the “Complainant’s T logo”).<sup>2</sup>

The Respondent is an individual based in Singapore.

The disputed domain names were registered on October 29, 2025. According to evidence presented by the Complainant, they formerly resolved to identical websites in English that appeared to be an investment trading platform. The sites were titled “Templum” and displayed the Complainant’s T logo and offered mobile applications for download. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names do not resolve to any active website; rather, they are passively held.

---

<sup>2</sup>The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has visited the website associated with the Complainant’s domain name to verify the Complainant’s allegations regarding its branding. The Panel considers this process of verification useful in assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.8.

## **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its core TEMPLUM mark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to register or use the TEMPLUM mark. The only conceivable argument for a legitimate interest would arise if the Respondent could demonstrate prior rights to the TEMPLUM mark, which is not the case.

The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. The disputed domain names are actively impersonating the Complainant by misusing its registered logo and closely replicating its business model and branding. Both websites display a QR code that directs visitors to download a fraudulent mobile application, demonstrating clear malicious intent and posing a significant risk of credential theft, malware installation, and financial fraud.

### **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Issue - Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <templume.org> is Chinese, while the language of the Registration Agreements for the other disputed domain names is English. 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 and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the keywords in consideration are derived from the English dictionary and registered in the United States by a United States company.

Despite the Center having sent, in Chinese and English, an email regarding the language of the proceeding and the Written Notice of the Complaint, the Respondent did not make any submission with respect to the language of the proceeding or indicate any interest in otherwise participating in the proceeding.

The Registration Agreements for three of the disputed domain names are in English, which indicates that the Respondent is able to understand that language.

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 3.0](#), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

## 6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (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.

### 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of the TEMPLUM trademark, among others, for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the TEMPLUM mark to be recognizable within each disputed domain name, despite the addition of the letter "e" in three disputed domain names. The only other element in each disputed domain name is a Top-Level Domain ("TLD") extension, variously ".cc", ".com", or ".org" which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name <templum.cc> is identical to the mark, and the disputed domain names <templume.cc>, <templume.com>, and <templume.org> are confusingly similar to the mark, for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present dispute, the disputed domain names formerly resolved to websites that impersonated the Complainant, displaying a title that comprised the Complainant's T logo and the Complainant's TEMPLUM mark, and offering what appeared to be the same type of services as those offered by the Complainant, i.e., investment trading services. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to register or use its TEMPLUM trademark. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names are passively held. Neither type of use constitutes a use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names for the purposes of the Policy. Further, the Registrar has verified that the

Respondent's name is "Sidney Edwiin", which does not resemble the disputed domain names. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names. Moreover, prior panels under the Policy have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation or passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the record, 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. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location."

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in October 2025, after the earliest registration of the Complainant's **TEMPLUM** mark. Although the mark is a Latin word meaning "temple", the disputed domain names were all formerly associated with websites that displayed the Complainant's T logo alongside the Complainant's **TEMPLUM** mark, and offered what appeared to be the same type of services as those offered by the Complainant, i.e., investment trading services. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its **TEMPLUM** mark when he registered the disputed domain names.

As regards use, the disputed domain names formerly resolved to websites offering what appeared to be the same type of services as those offered by the Complainant. One of the disputed domain names is identical to the Complainant's **TEMPLUM** mark while the other three added a letter "e", producing a word that appears to have no other meaning than as a misspelling. The disputed domain names appear to have operated by intentionally attracting Internet users searching for the Complainant and its services – including those who misspelt the Complainant's mark – and diverting them to the Respondent's websites, which impersonated the Complainant. These circumstances fall within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Further, prior panels under the Policy have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation or passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel takes note that the use of the disputed domain names has changed and that they no longer resolve to any active websites. However, this change in use does not alter the Panel's conclusion; if anything, it may be a further indication of bad faith.

Therefore, 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 names <templum.cc>, <templume.cc>, <templume.com>, and <templume.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Matthew Kennedy/*

**Matthew Kennedy**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 10, 2026