

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Titan Wealth Holdings Limited v. Work Space, Websites

Case No. D2025-5384

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Titan Wealth Holdings Limited, United Kingdom (“UK”), represented by Mills & Reeve LLP, UK.

The Respondent is Work Space, Websites, UK.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <titanwealth.org> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 23, 2025. On December 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On December 24, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Not Disclosed/ The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 24, 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 December 24, 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 December 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on January 30, 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 private limited company registered in Jersey on November 10, 2020. It is a wealth management company offering a range of investment solutions for clients including discretionary fund management with trade, custody and settlement services.

The Complainant is a global business with operations in the UK, Guernsey, Jersey, Australia, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, South Africa, Singapore, Hong Kong, China, Mauritius and Malaysia. For the year ended March 31, 2024 (prior to the registration of the Domain Name), the Complainant's group of companies managed assets to the value of GBP 11.42 billion and had a turnover of GBP 77,378,000.

The Complainant has traded under the mark TITAN WEALTH since at least 2021. The Complainant's group of companies has registered several domain names containing the TITAN WEALTH mark, including:

<titanwh.com>, registered October 22, 2020; <titanwealthsolutions.com>, registered November 24, 2021; and <titanwealthinternational.com>, registered April 17, 2024.

These domain names resolve to the Complainant's websites at which it advertises its wealth management services and solutions under and by reference to the TITAN WEALTH mark. Archived versions of the websites from 2022, 2023 and 2024 demonstrate that the TITAN WEALTH mark has featured prominently on the Complainant's websites since before the registration of the Domain Name.

The Complainant has been regularly featured in trade press, including City Wire, a specialist publication covering the wealth management sector. Articles from July 2022, October 2023 and April 2024 report on acquisitions made by the Complainant, with the TITAN WEALTH mark prominently featured.

The Domain Name was registered on June 9, 2024. It does not currently resolve to an active website. However, the Complainant has adduced evidence that at the time of preparation of the Complaint, it resolved to a website at the Domain Name with the name TITAN in the banner of the webpages, describing the operators of the website as TITAN WEALTH (the "Respondent's website"). At the foot of the About Us page, it stated "TITAN WEALTH We are a licensed asset management and financial service provider based in the UK". The website advertised financial services, including investment plans, which are identical or highly similar to the services offered by the Complainant.

The website included a web page entitled "Certificate" which displayed what purported to be a certificate of incorporation for "Titan Wealth" as a UK company. The certificate is a falsified document. The UK company number shown on the certificate (BR024998) is in fact the UK establishment number assigned to the Complainant when it registered as an overseas company with Companies House.

The Respondent's details as disclosed by the Registrar are false. The address in the WhoIs record for the Respondent does not exist and comprises elements including part of the Complainant's address in Jersey and a postcode in England.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to its TITAN WEALTH trademark (the "Mark"), that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the 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 Domain Name; and
- (iii) the 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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has demonstrated unregistered trademark rights in the mark TITAN WEALTH through extensive use in commerce since at least 2021. The Complainant has been trading under its registered company name Titan Wealth Holdings Limited since its incorporation in November 2020 and has used the TITAN WEALTH mark prominently in its business operations as a wealth management company. The evidence establishes that the Complainant has acquired secondary meaning and goodwill in the TITAN WEALTH mark within the financial services industry. The Complainant manages assets valued at GBP 11.42 billion with an annual turnover of GBP 77.4 million. It operates globally across multiple jurisdictions and has been featured regularly in specialist trade publications. The Complainant has maintained a consistent online presence through multiple domain names incorporating the TITAN WEALTH mark since October 2020. This evidence demonstrates that the TITAN WEALTH mark has become distinctive of the Complainant's services and is recognized by the relevant public as indicating the Complainant.

Common law trademark rights can be established under the UDRP by showing that a mark has acquired secondary meaning or has become a distinctive identifier associated with the complainant or its goods and services. See section 1.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). The Panel finds that the Complainant has established unregistered rights in the TITAN WEALTH mark.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain ".org" the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's TITAN WEALTH trademark.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is identical to the Mark and 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. Accordingly, 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 made out a strong prima facie case that the Respondent could have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but for a fraudulent impersonation of the Complainant, as evidenced by its use of a forged certificate of incorporation and the contents of the Respondent’s website.

UDRP panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (such as impersonation or passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

There is no suggestion that the Respondent has ever been known by the Domain Name. The Respondent has chosen not to respond to the Complainant or to take any steps to counter the prima facie case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the 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 light of the nature of the Domain Name, identical to the Mark, and the Respondent’s use of its website to impersonate the Complainant and purport to provide wealth management services and investment plans identical or highly similar to those offered by the Complainant, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent has registered and, as set out above, used the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant and to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark. In the Panel’s view, the use of a domain name for such activity, clearly with a view to commercial gain, amounts to paradigm bad faith registration and use for the purposes of the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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

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 Domain Name <titanwealth.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/lan Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: February 11, 2026