

ADMINISTRATIVE Panel DECISION

Laban Edward Roomes v. Manish Pratap Manshani, Leronza
Case No. D2026-0030

1. The Parties

Complainant is Laban Edward Roomes, United Arab Emirates, represented by Al Tamimi & Company, United Arab Emirates.

Respondent is Manish Pratap Manshani, Leronza, United Arab Emirates, represented by Azad & Azad Legal Consultancy, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <leronza.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 6, 2026. On January 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On January 8, 2026, 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 (Mohit Rajesh Mirchandani Rajesh Vishnu Mirchandani / Leronza Electronics Trading LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on January 9, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on January 12, 2026.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 8, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on February 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on February 17, 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 Parties both sell luxury electronics such as gold-plated cell phones and laptop computers. Complainant uses a figurative trademark LL LERONZA LONDON (hereinafter the “Mark”):



Complainant owns trademark registrations for the Mark, including:

- International Registration No. 1828957 (Registered October 15, 2024) (designating the European Union and United Arab Emirates), and
- United Kingdom Registration No. 00004105900 (Registered December 20, 2024).

Complainant owns several domain names that include the term “leronza” that it uses to promote its sales. Complainant registered most of these domain names in 2025. One of the domain names was registered in 2023 and two of the domain names were registered in 2024. Based on the Panel’s sampling, the majority of the verifiable domain names redirect to the domain name <leronza.ae>.

The Disputed Domain Name, which was registered on November 13, 2018, resolves to a webpage of Leronza Electronics Trading LLC that promotes the sale of luxury electronics, especially gold-plated cell phones and laptops.

On September 26, 2025, Complainant sent Respondent a cease-and-desist asserting infringement of Mark.

In November 2025, Complainant filed a trademark infringement complaint with the Dubai Department of Economy and Tourism (DET), which thereafter conducted an inspection of Respondent’s premises and confiscated five items, which are not described in the DET documentation submitted with the Complaint.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that:

- It owns trademark rights to the Mark worldwide.
- Respondent does business as Leronza Electronics Trading LLC, which is a successor to Goldgenie Trading LLC (“Goldgenie”).
- Respondent was an “insider” with Goldgenie, “a company associated with the Complainant” that, like the present Parties, sold luxury electronics, and which started the Leronza brand after Goldgenie failed commercially.
- Respondent’s relationship with Goldgenie and Leronza brand “terminated” at some point and that, “[f]ollowing the termination of that relationship, the Respondent appropriated the LERONZA name and registered a new corporate entity under the name ‘Leronza Electronics Trading L.L.C.,’ thereby seeking to create the false impression of continuity, affiliation, or legitimacy. Shortly thereafter, Respondent registered and began using the domain name <leronza.com>, which is identical to Complainant’s trademark.”

- Respondent uses <leronza.com> to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's Mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.
- "While the Complainant's formal trademark registrations post-date the registration of the [D]isputed [D]omain [N]ame, the Respondent's registration occurred with actual prior knowledge of Complainant's earlier-created distinctive mark – derived from the Complainant's name and developed within the Goldgenie business – thereby satisfying the bad-faith requirement under the Policy notwithstanding the timing of registration."

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Respondent contends that:

- Complainant was not an owner of Goldgenie or its successor Leronza Electronics Trading, LLC
- Leronza Electronics LLC existed since October 15, 2017, when it received a commercial license from the Government of Dubai.
- The Internet Archive includes 140 captured snapshots of active websites associated with the Disputed Domain Name dating back to September 16, 2019.
- That Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in good faith for Leronza Electronics Trading LLC, on November 13, 2018.
- On December 7, 2023, the current owner acquired 100 percent of Leronza Electronics Trading LLC ownership shares, and Respondent was simultaneously appointed as the sole representative and manager of the company.
- Respondent has for many years prior to notice of this dispute maintained a showroom in Dubai using the trade name Leronza Electronics Trading LLC.
- Respondent has paid tax bills directed to Leronza Electronics Trading LLC, as evidence by Tax invoices and receipts from at least 2022.
- Since well before it received notice of this dispute Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to promote, sell and deliver authentic product, as evidenced by copies of invoices for product ordered before Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter in September 2025, including an invoice for an order placed by Complainant for a 24k Gold iPhone 15 Pro Max in September 2023.

Respondent requests that the Panel issues a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

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 Complainant's trademark and the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Where a trademark registration includes design elements, panels tend to focus on the non-design elements for purposes of assessing confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the registered trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

However, as explained in the discussion below of bad faith, the Panel finds that Complainant has not established that it owned any unregistered rights before the effective dates of its trademark registrations. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds that, before notice to Respondent of the dispute, Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name and a corresponding tradename in connection with a bona fide offering of goods. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.

In 2018 (or 2019 at the latest), Respondent began using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with the sale of electronics via Leronza Electronics Trading LLC, the company he identified as registrant organization when he registered the Disputed Domain Name and for which Respondent was at various times a Manager.

The balance of evidence also indicates that Respondent was a Manager of the company whose name corresponds to the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent's documentary evidence includes:

- A copy of a commercial license issued by Government of Dubai to Leronza Electronics Trading LLC dated October 15, 2017, naming Respondent as a Manager.
- A notarized "Amendment to the Memorandum of Association" dated April 24, 2019, changing the name of Goldgenie LLC to Leronza Electronics Trading LLC.
- A signed "Amendment to the Memorandum of Association" dated December 7, 2023, whereby the current owner represented by Respondent acquired 100 percent of Leronza Electronics LLC ownership shares.

This evidence persuades the Panel that Respondent started using the company name Leronza Electronics Trading LLC, which corresponds to the Disputed Domain Name, long before receiving any notice of this dispute. Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that Respondent's aim in registering the Disputed Domain Name was to profit from or exploit Complainant's Mark.

The Panel finds that Respondent did not register the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith targeting of Complainant or its Mark because Complainant had no trademark rights at the time that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in 2018. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1. None of Complainant's trademark registrations were in effect when Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in 2018 and no trademark applications for the Mark had even been filed.

As noted above, Complainant argues that, "[w]hile the Complainant's formal trademark registrations post-date the registration of the [D]isputed [D]omain [N]ame, the Respondent's registration occurred with actual prior knowledge of Complainant's earlier-created distinctive mark—derived from the Complainant's name and developed within the Goldgenie business—thereby satisfying the bad-faith requirement under the Policy notwithstanding the timing of registration." The Panel is not persuaded.

There is no evidence that any party owned unregistered trademark rights in an "earlier-created distinctive mark - derived from the Complainant's name..." when the Disputed Domain Name was registered in 2018. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3 (conclusory allegations of common law right not sufficient). Moreover, if there were any such rights, Complainant has not offered any evidence that it owned any such rights or indeed any rights in either Goldgenie or Leronza Electronics Trading LLC, or any rights in any purported unregistered rights at any time.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

The Panel finds that the available record is insufficient to determine the Complainant brought the Complaint in bad faith. The Parties have a complicated history of interactions. The Panel concludes that there is likely more to this story than the record reveals and that Respondent has not proved that bad faith is the most probable motivation for the Complaint.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026