ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mirantis, Inc. v. SHIVAM BAJPAI, EasyLauncher
Case No. D2026-0077

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mirantis, Inc., United States of America, represented by Waterman Legal, United States of America (the “United States”).

The Respondent is SHIVAM BAJPAI, EasyLauncher, India, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <metamirantis.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 9, 2026. On January 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On January 9, 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 (Data Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 19, 2026, 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 January 22, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on January 25, 2026, copied to the Complainant’s representative, asking “Please provide more details. What this is about?”. The Center acknowledged receipt and advised the Respondent of the nature of the proceeding.

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 January 29, 2026. On February 9, 2026, within the Response period, the Respondent sent a further email to the Center, copying the Complainant’s representative and the Registrar. This communication is further detailed below in section 5B. The Center acknowledged receipt of this communication on February 9, 2026, and advised the Respondent that it would be treated as the Response unless advised otherwise.

No further communication from the Respondent was received. On February 23, 2026, the Center notified the parties of the commencement of the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 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 technology company incorporated in the United States, with its principal place of business at Campbell, California. The Complainant provides software for managing complex hybrid and multi-cloud environments, including solutions aimed at simplifying IT operations and automation. The Complainant operates its primary website at "www.mirantis.com".

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registered trademarks for the word mark MIRANTIS in multiple jurisdictions, including: United States Registration No. 2,854,283, registered June 15, 2004, covering International Classes 35 and 42 (with a first use in commerce date of February 4, 2004); United States Registration No. 4,988,171, registered June 28, 2016, covering International Classes 9, 16, 38, 41, and 42; European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 014977748, registered May 5, 2016; United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. UK00914977748, registered January 6, 2016; and WIPO International Registration No. 1396710, registered January 6, 2018, designating multiple jurisdictions including Australia and India. Additional registrations subsist in Brazil, China, Japan, and Switzerland. These trademarks are referred to as the "MIRANTIS trademark" in this decision. The word MIRANTIS appears to be a fanciful, invented term with no dictionary meaning in any language.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 13, 2025. According to the Registrar-verified WhoIs data, the registrant is Shivam Bajpai, associated with an entity called "EasyLauncher," located in New Delhi, India.

As evidenced by screenshots at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved at that time to a website displaying the branding "Meta Mirantis | Future of IT Solutions." The website described its stated purpose as providing "tailored digital experiences and robust IT infrastructures that empower businesses to lead in a connected world," and featured a countdown clock indicating the imminent launch of the "Meta Mirantis" business. The website invited visitors to provide their email address to be notified upon launch. A copyright notice reading "© 2025 Meta Mirantis. All rights reserved" appeared in the footer.

The Respondent, through its informal communication to the Center, submitted a Certificate of Incorporation issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, certifying that METAMIRANTIS TECH PRIVATE LIMITED (CIN: U62091UP2025PTC237035) was incorporated on November 26, 2025 — approximately 17 days before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends as follows.

First, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the MIRANTIS trademark. The Complainant submits that the MIRANTIS trademark is a wholly fanciful, invented term with no meaning in the English language, and that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the mark in its entirety. The mere addition of the prefix "meta" does not dispel the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the MIRANTIS trademark. The Complainant contends that consumers encountering the string "metamirantis" are likely to perceive it as referencing a higher-level or enhanced variant of the Complainant's products or services.

Second, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not been authorised to use the MIRANTIS trademark, is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, and is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's use of the domain name to operate a commercial website in the IT services sector under the "Meta Mirantis" branding is calculated to exploit the goodwill associated with the MIRANTIS trademark.

Third, the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on December 13, 2025, long after the Complainant's first use and registration of its MIRANTIS mark, and that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website advertising IT infrastructure and digital services directly competitive with those of the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy — intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and services.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal Response in accordance with the Rules. The sole substantive communication received from the Respondent — an email dated February 9, 2026 and treated by the Center and the Panel as a Response (as per the Panel's discussion below) — stated: "We already have registered the business with name Metamirantis in India with CIN: U62091UP2025PTC237035. Our company registration date is before the domain registration." The Respondent attached the Certificate of Incorporation for METAMIRANTIS TECH PRIVATE LIMITED, incorporated on November 26, 2025.

The Respondent offered no further explanation of the circumstances of registration, no account of how or why the name "Metamirantis" was independently derived, and no denial of knowledge of the Complainant or its trademark.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: The Respondent's Informal Communication

The Panel notes that the Respondent did not submit a formal Response in accordance with the requirements of the Rules. The Respondent's email of February 9, 2026 was received within the Response period and was acknowledged by the Center to be treated as the Respondent's Response if no further communications were received. The Panel elects to admit and consider this communication and its attachment in the exercise of its discretion under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel notes, however, that the Respondent's communication is brief and does not address the majority of the Complainant's contentions. The Panel proceeds on the basis of the Complaint, the Respondent's informal communication, and the full case record. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

6.2. Substantive Matters

To succeed, the Complainant must establish, in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, that each of the three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied:

(i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(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

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

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 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has adduced extensive documentary evidence establishing ownership of numerous registered trademarks for the word mark MIRANTIS in multiple jurisdictions, including Australia, Brazil, China, the European Union, India, Japan, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States, with the earliest registered right dating to June 15, 2004. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has well-established rights in the MIRANTIS mark.

For the purpose of comparison under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") suffix ".com" is disregarded as a standard registration requirement. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11. The relevant string is therefore "metamirantis." The MIRANTIS mark is incorporated in its entirety within that string, to which the additional prefix "meta" has been prepended. It is well established that where a complainant's trademark is recognisable within a Disputed Domain Name, the addition of other terms — whether descriptive, generic, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise — does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8; see also *Britannia Building Society v. Britannia Fraud Prevention*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0505 and the cases therein cited.

The Panel finds that the MIRANTIS mark is immediately and clearly recognisable within the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel accordingly finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MIRANTIS trademark, and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. It is well established that a complainant is required only to make out a prima facie case under this element, whereupon the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1. Where a respondent fails to discharge that burden, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three circumstances, any one of which, if demonstrated by a respondent, may establish rights or legitimate interests: (i) before any notice of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; (ii) the respondent having been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name; or (iii) legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the mark at issue.

The Complainant has made a prima facie case. There is no evidence that the Respondent has any affiliation with, authorisation from, or licence granted by the Complainant to use the MIRANTIS mark. The Complainant originated and has exclusively used the MIRANTIS mark, which is a wholly invented term. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the name "Metamirantis" in any sense that is independent of the Complainant's trademark.

The sole contention advanced by the Respondent is that it incorporated a company in India under the name METAMIRANTIS TECH PRIVATE LIMITED on November 26, 2025 — approximately 17 days before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name on December 13, 2025 — and that this prior incorporation provides a basis for its claimed rights or legitimate interests. The Panel has considered this contention carefully but finds it insufficient to establish rights or legitimate interests for the following reasons.

First, while a respondent may in appropriate circumstances rely upon its company name as a basis for claimed rights or legitimate interests under the Policy (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.3), this basis is not available where the company name was itself adopted in bad faith, with the purpose of trading upon a complainant's established trademark rights. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.12. The temporal proximity between the incorporation (November 26, 2025) and the domain name registration (December 13, 2025), together with the fact that the MIRANTIS mark had been in use and registered internationally for over 20 years prior to either event, strongly suggests that the company was incorporated specifically to provide a veneer of legitimacy for the subsequent acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name. A company incorporation certificate, while official, does not of itself confer any intellectual property rights, and cannot legitimise the adoption of a name that deliberately replicates a well-established third-party trademark. Even where a company is properly constituted under an applicable legal system the Panel does not consider that a respondent who deliberately adopts a name which corresponds to, or is similar to, that of a complainant, with a view to taking advantage of that complainant's fame and reputation, can then take advantage of an "own name" provision to justify its actions. The right to use one's own name is not unlimited and cannot be used to circumvent well known prior rights in a similar name – see for example *Peter Frampton vs. Frampton Enterprises, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2002-0141:

> While the Panel recognizes that any individual has a right to use his(her) name in connection with a business, that right is not unfettered; instead, it is circumscribed by the prior trademark rights of others who use that name in connection with specific goods and services, as is certainly the case here.
>
> A party alleging, under paragraph 4(c)(ii), as the Respondent purports to do here, that it is commonly known by a particular name, sufficient to show legitimate rights and interest in a domain name that contains that particular personal name (e.g., a surname), must provide adequate extrinsic proof that a corresponding group of consumers, e.g., Internet users, who are likely to access that party's web site, associates that domain name with that party rather than with the trademark owner, i.e., that domain name possesses requisite secondary meaning, or at least that party has used or is using that name sufficiently broadly such a panel can infer that such meaning exists.

The Panel agrees with that approach in the circumstances of the present case. More fundamentally it should be noted that what paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy requires is that the Respondents demonstrate that they are commonly known as the Disputed Domain Name. It is not sufficient for the Respondent to say its name is "METAMIRANTIS TECH PRIVATE LIMITED" – it has to show that it is commonly known as "METAMIRANTIS TECH PRIVATE LIMITED" or some contraction thereof. No evidence at all to this effect has been produced by the Respondent. The Panel therefore does not consider that the Respondent's incorporation of METAMIRANTIS TECH PRIVATE LIMITED entitles it to claim a right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

Further, the website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves openly operates under the branding "Meta Mirantis | Future of IT Solutions" and describes services in IT infrastructure and digital experience — the precise sector in which the Complainant operates under the MIRANTIS mark. The Respondent has offered no explanation for the selection of the name "Metamirantis," nor any evidence that the term was independently conceived. Given the high degree of inherent distinctiveness of the MIRANTIS mark and the direct overlap between the Parties described services, no credible explanation presents itself other than that the Respondent adopted the name with knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and with the intention of exploiting that mark commercially.

Additionally, the Respondent's website is plainly a commercial undertaking, inviting users to subscribe for launch notification and describing the business as one providing IT infrastructure and digital services for commercial purposes. This precludes reliance on paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

In the absence of any credible evidence of independent rights or legitimate interests, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case, and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that shall be evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Registration in bad faith.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 13, 2025. At that date, the Complainant held registered trademarks for the fanciful, invented term MIRANTIS for over 20 years, including United States registrations dating to June 2004 and registrations across numerous other jurisdictions. The MIRANTIS trademark has no independent meaning in any language and it is unlikely to have been independently coined by the Respondent by chance. The Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its long-established MIRANTIS mark at the time of registration. This inference is reinforced by the following circumstances. The MIRANTIS mark is a wholly fanciful term with no generic or descriptive significance. The Complainant is an established international technology company active in cloud software and IT infrastructure services. The Respondent's own website uses the Disputed Domain Name in connection with IT infrastructure and digital services — the precise sector in which the Complainant operates under its MIRANTIS trademark. The coincidence of the sector, the wholly invented nature of the mark, and the temporal proximity between the company incorporation and the domain registration together lead to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with knowledge of the Complainant's mark. UDRP panels have consistently held that registration of a domain name incorporating a complainant's distinctive, fanciful mark, in circumstances where the respondent cannot plausibly have been unaware of that mark, constitutes registration in bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Use in bad faith

The Panel further finds that the Disputed Domain Name is being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy identifies, as evidence of bad faith, circumstances in which the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or services. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website explicitly branded "Meta Mirantis | Future of IT Solutions", which describes the offering of tailored digital experiences and robust IT infrastructures — services squarely within the field in which the Complainant operates under its MIRANTIS mark. An Internet user encountering the website at the Disputed Domain Name <metamirantis.com> would in all likelihood believe that they had reached a website associated with, endorsed by, or in some way connected to the Complainant. The use of the "Meta Mirantis" branding, incorporating the Complainant's wholly fanciful mark in full, further compounds the likelihood of confusion.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has not provided any credible justification for the adoption of a name that incorporates a 20-year-old fanciful trademark belonging to the Complainant. When notified of the dispute, the Respondent first asked simply what the matter concerned, and then advanced only the bare assertion that its company incorporation pre-dated the domain name registration — without addressing the substance of the Complainant's case, without denying knowledge of the Complainant or its mark, and without offering any account of why it selected the name "Metamirantis". The Panel draws adverse inferences from the Respondent's failure to provide any credible explanation. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <metamirantis.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nick J. Gardner/
Nick J. Gardner
Sole Panelist
Date: March 6, 2026