

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Trading Central S.A. v. Ads John, Mahmoud Andersom
Case No. D2026-0116

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Trading Central S.A., France, represented by Open Plan Law Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Ads John, South Africa, and Mahmoud Andersom, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <tcentralfx.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain name <tradecenfxf.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 12, 2026. On January 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 13, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrants and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (TRADING CENTRAL FX; TREVOR MAIN) and contact information in the Complaint.

On January 14, 2026, the Center sent an email communication to the Complainant with the registrants and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on January 19, 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 the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 15, 2026. A party using an email address associated with the disputed domain name <tcentralfx.com> sent an email communication to the Center on January 26, 2026. On February 16, 2026, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of the Panel Appointment Process.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on February 18, 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 describes itself as an investment research house established 25 years ago, which provides actionable analytics and insights to investors through brokerage platforms. The Complainant states that it has offices in Paris, New York, and London, and its official website is located at the domain name <tradingcentral.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for TRADING CENTRAL (the "TRADING CENTRAL trademark"):

- the United Kingdom trademark TRADING CENTRAL with No. UK00003563520, registered on April 9, 2021, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 36, 38, and 41; and
- the European Union Trade Mark TRADING CENTRAL with No. 018349979, registered on May 11, 2021, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 36, 38, and 41.

The details about the dates of registration of the disputed domain names, their registrars, registrants and current status are the following:

Disputed domain name	Date of registration	Registrant	Status of the disputed domain name at the time of filing of the Complaint	Current status of the disputed domain name
<tcentralfx.com>	November 26, 2024	Mahmoud Andersom	Resolved to a website that displayed the logo TRADING CENTRAL FX and the copyright notice "(c) 2024 Trading Central FX" and offered investment-related information and services	Internet browsers block the website and display a warning for a potential phishing attempt
<tradecenfxxvip.com>	October 15, 2025	Ads John	Resolved to a website that displayed the logo TRADING CENTRAL FX and the copyright notice "(c) 2024 CentralFX VIP", offered trade and investment services in relation to cryptocurrencies, and indicated the same contact email address as the website at <tcentralfx.com>	Internet browsers display the error code "404: NOT_FOUND"

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its TRADING CENTRAL trademark, because they include a significant part of this trademark. As to the other elements "fx" and "fxvip", the Complainant notes that "fx" is an abbreviation of "forex", a type of trading based on foreign currencies, while "vip" is an acronym that refers to premium or special services often provided in exchange for higher prices. According to the Complainant, the addition of these elements to the disputed domain names is not sufficient to preclude a finding of confusing similarity with its trademark.

The Complainant notes that the two disputed domain names resolve to website that purport to provide similar services to those offered by the Complainant, such as the provision of insights into the investment sector through analysis of the financial sector, the provision of "signals" that allow consumers to make informed investment decisions, and the provision of a tool for cryptocurrency analysis. The Complainant adds that the website at the disputed domain name <tcentralfx.com> includes a moving banner that displays links to websites that it claims to have been featured on, but the links are either non-functional or redirect to articles relating to the Complainant. According to the Complainant, this shows an attempt to confuse Internet users that the disputed domain name <tcentralfx.com> is associated with the Complainant. The Complainant also points out that the website at the disputed domain name <tradecenfxvip.com> displays the Complainant's TRADING CENTRAL trademark.

According to the Complainant, the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant states that it is highly regarded in the financial sector as a producer of analytical tools for the financial markets and has received several awards. The Complainant points out that the disputed domain names resolve to websites that offer commercial services and display the Complainant's TRADING CENTRAL trademark, and that the Instagram, Facebook, Telegram, and Skool social media profiles with the name "Trading Central FX" represent the websites at the disputed domain names as associated with the Complainant.

The Complainant notes that both Scamadviser.com and the ESET computer security software firm warn that the website at the disputed domain name <tcentralfx.com> is unsafe, and that the United Kingdom Financial Conduct Authority has issued a public warning stating that the Respondent is not authorised to provide financial services in the United Kingdom and may be operating without the requisite licence.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that this is not the first UDRP dispute between the Complainant and the Respondents. The Complainant refers to the decision in *Trading Central S.A. v. Amir Jabur*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0142](#) in relation to the domain name <tradingcentralfx.com>, and notes that this domain name resolved to a website with the same content as the website at the disputed domain name <tcentralfx.com>.

According to the Complainant, given that the Respondents are aware of the Complainant, the use of its TRADING CENTRAL trademark on the websites at the disputed domain names and the linked social media profiles demonstrate an intention to take advantage of the Complainant's goodwill and reputation by creating a confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites at the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

In an informal email communication to the Center, a party, identifying itself as "Trevir Main", made the following statement (sic): "there's not website live called tcentralfx.com?" from an email address associated with the disputed domain name <tcentralfx.com>.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issue - Consolidation of multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name registrants are under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. In support of its consolidation request, the Complainant points out that the two disputed domain names operate under the same trade name “Trading Central” and variations of it such as “Trading Central FX”, “Tcentral FX”, and “TC FX”, offer similar services, indicate the same email address in their contact details, and display a link to the same Telegram profile. According to the Complainant, this shows that there is a common control over the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant’s consolidation request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant’s request, the Panel will consider whether the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and whether the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the evidence in the case shows that the disputed domain names have resolved to commercial websites that offered investments-related services and advice similar to the services offered by the Complainant, displayed a logo that it almost identical to the Complainant’s TRADING CENTRAL trademark, provided the same contact email address, and displayed a link to the same Telegram profile account. This supports a conclusion that the two disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the TRADING CENTRAL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

As discussed in section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), a domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognisable aspects of the relevant mark.

Examples of such variations include (i) adjacent keyboard letters, (ii) substitution of similar-appearing characters (e.g., upper vs lower-case letters or numbers used to look like letters), (iii) the use of different letters that appear similar in different fonts, (iv) the use of non-Latin internationalised or accented characters, (v) the inversion of letters and numbers, (vi) the addition or interspersion of other terms or numbers, or (vii) plays on the mark (e.g., abbreviations or combinations of select elements of the mark).

The disputed domain names include “tcentral” or “tradecen”, both of which represent abbreviations or combinations of elements of the Complainant’s TRADING CENTRAL trademark, and it remains recognisable within them. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the TRADING CENTRAL trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “fx” or “fxvip”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the TRADING CENTRAL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 recognised that proving that 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

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.

The disputed domain names represent confusingly similar variations of the Complainant’s TRADING CENTRAL trademark. At the time of filing of the Complaint, they resolved to websites that displayed a TRADING CENTRAL FX logo and offered financial services similar to or competing with the services offered by the Complainant. The Respondent is also using social network profiles with user names that are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and which profiles refer to the disputed domain names.

In the absence of any evidence that may be interpreted differently, the above supports a conclusion that it is more likely than not that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant’s TRADING CENTRAL trademark with the registration and use of the disputed domain names and has done so in an attempt to generate commercial gain or other advantages by exploiting the goodwill of the Complainant. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain names. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that third parties have issued warnings for illegitimate activities carried out through the disputed domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

As discussed above in this decision, the Respondent has used variations of the Complainant's TRADING CENTRAL trademark to compose the disputed domain names and has used them for commercial websites displaying a logo that is almost identical to the same trademark and offering financial services in competition with the Complainant. Third parties have issued warnings in relation to the disputed domain names and the associated websites.

In the absence of any denial or contrary evidence, this leads the Panel to the conclusion that by registering and using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the websites at the disputed domain names by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source or affiliation of these websites and of the financial services and advice offered on them. This supports a conclusion of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The fact that the disputed domain names are currently inaccessible or inactive does not change this conclusion.

The Panel therefore 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 <tcentralfx.com> and <tradecenfxfvip.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: March 2, 2026