

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ollama Inc. v. Vladislav Zhelkovsky
Case No. D2026-0123

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ollama Inc., Canada, represented by Coates IP LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Vladislav Zhelkovsky, Kazakhstan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ollama.org> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 13, 2026. On January 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 13, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 14, 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 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew F. Christie as the sole panelist in this matter on February 20, 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.

On March 10, 2026, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1 (“Procedural Order”), in which the Complainant was requested to file: (i) a statement of the earliest date on which the Complainant commenced using in commerce its OLLAMA word trademark, and evidence thereof; (ii) a statement of who was the registrant of the disputed domain name at the date of the Complainant’s earliest use in commerce of its OLLAMA word trademark, and evidence thereof; (iii) an explanation of the significance of the change of name server host on or around February 18, 2025; and (iv) a clarification of the Complainant’s bad faith contentions, as to how the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Procedural Order invited the Respondent to reply to any of the Complainant’s submissions filed in compliance with the Procedural Order. The Complainant filed a response to the Procedural Order. No submission was received from the Respondent.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a software company based in Toronto, Canada. It provides software that lets users run artificial intelligence large language models locally on their computer, instead of sending data to the cloud. It provides a model library, with ready-to-run model files in a simple prompt/chat interface. The Complainant has partnered with large technology clients for service integration and support, including Meta, OpenAI, NVIDIA, Google, and IBM.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for the word mark OLLAMA, including United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. 3991401 (registered on April 5, 2024), Japanese Trademark Registration No. 6860443 (registered on October 31, 2024) and Taiwan Province of China Trademark Registration No. 02473413 (registered on August 1, 2025). It is also the owner of a number of trademark registrations for the design mark consisting of a simple line drawing of the head of a llama seen front-on, including United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. 3991402 (registered on April 5, 2024), Japanese Trademark Registration No. 6860444 (registered on October 31, 2024) and Taiwan Province of China Trademark Registration No. 02473414 (registered on November 11, 2024).

The disputed domain name was registered on July 20, 2022. The Complainant provided screenshots of the Internet Archive Wayback Machine records dated December 29, 2025, showing that the disputed domain name resolved to a website headed “Ollama: AI at Your Fingertips”, with text that stated, among other things, “Ollama is an advanced AI platform that brings large language models directly to your device”, and containing numerous other references to “Ollama” in the context of AI. It also contains some simple line drawings similar to the Complainant’s design mark. At the bottom of the website is the statement “Please note that we are not affiliated with Ollama in any official capacity”.

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name redirects to a website at “www.freegpt.ai”, purporting to offer a “free online AI assistant powered by large language models”.

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 name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights, on the following grounds, among others. The Complainant has registered and common law rights in the OLLAMA mark in Canada, the United States, United Kingdom, European Union, China, India, Japan, Republic of Korea, and Taiwan Province of China. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's OLLAMA word mark with the only difference being the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). The Complainant established rights in the OLLAMA mark as early as August 1, 2023, well prior to the May 4, 2025, date on which the Respondent began using the OLLAMA trademark and logo on its website.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, on the following grounds, among others. The OLLAMA mark is a fanciful term by Complainant with no meaning other than to identify Complainant's company, brand, products and services. The only reason why Complainant (sic – presumably this should read "Respondent") would incorporate that term in the disputed domain name is to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant's OLLAMA mark. The Respondent has no rights in the Complainant's OLLAMA mark, prior or subsequent, and provides identical competing products and services under the OLLAMA mark in commerce. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has acquired no trademark or service mark rights in the OLLAMA mark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, on the following grounds, among others. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name and the Complainant's OLLAMA mark and a highly similar logo to advertise and offer identical language model services under the OLLAMA mark. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves was launched on or around May 4, 2025, long after the Complainant established trademark rights in the OLLAMA mark. It is inconceivable that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant. This is clear with the Respondent's incorporation on its website of the OLLAMA mark and the Complainant's logo. The Respondent has no rights to the OLLAMA mark and logo and is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name for fraudulent purposes by creating use of the Complainant's OLLAMA mark and logo merely to dupe unsuspecting users of the Complainant to share their login credentials and unwittingly provide access and control of their digital accounts and assets to the Respondent. The mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure bad faith. In such cases, panels may consider the Respondent's use of a disclaimer as an admission by the Respondent that users may be confused.

In response to the Panel's request in the Procedural Order for information and evidence of the earliest date on which the Complainant commenced using in commerce its OLLAMA word trademark, the Complainant said: (i) it was established as a company in Ontario, Canada, on August 26, 2019; became part of the Y Combinator startup accelerator in the winter of 2021; (ii) it began offering its software services to others under the OLLAMA trademark in commerce at least as early as June 23, 2023, through the provision of artificial intelligence services using the Python SDK and API programming language; (iii) it opened and added its OLLAMA software to a GitHub repository on July 8, 2023; and (iv) programmers were accessing the Complainant's tools via its GitHub site by at least July 19, 2023. As evidence of the above, the Complainant provided a screenshot of its initial GitHub repository entry, a printout of the Y Combinator website showing it was part of its 2021 winter class of startups, a printout of Pitchbook showing that the Complainant had been in development at least as early as 2021, and a printout of the Ontario Business Registry regarding Complainant.

In response to the Panel's request in the Procedural Order for information and evidence of who was the registrant of the disputed domain name at the date of the Complainant's earliest use in commerce of its OLLAMA word trademark, the Complainant said: (i) it cannot ascertain the identity of the disputed domain name's registrant at the date of Complainant's first use of the OLLAMA trademark; (ii) the historic Whois records for the disputed domain name from April 25, 2023, to October 3, 2023, show that it was registered under privacy service and the identity of the registrant at that time is not available; and (iii) from its creation date, and as evidenced between April 25, 2023, and July 5, 2024, the disputed domain name remained on Registrar's name servers, strongly suggesting it was owned by the Registrar and remained inactive or parked. As evidence of the above, the Complainant provided copies of the Whois, DNS, and IP records for the disputed domain name.

In response to the Panel's request in the Procedural Order for an explanation of the significance of the change of name server host on or around February 18, 2025, and a clarification of the Complainant's bad faith contentions as to how the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Complainant said: (i) a flurry of activity on the disputed domain name's Whois and name server records in February 2025 indicate that the disputed domain name's ownership and control changed on or around February 18, 2025, to the current Respondent; (ii) based on a specified timeline, which includes material technical control pivots and patterns characteristic of acquisition, one can reasonably infer that Respondent became the registrant on or around February 18, 2025; (iii) panels recognize that the relevant registration date for bad faith is when the current respondent gained control, not necessarily when the disputed domain name was first created; (iv) technical indicators can replace a formal registration date change where the totality of the circumstances strongly implies control has transferred; (v) evidence that supports inferred ownership/control change includes, for example, a recent Whois update closely followed by use unambiguously targeting the complainant; in this case, the Respondent's bad faith use occurs shortly after a constellation of significant record changes during a small window in February 2025, indicating control of the disputed domain name was transferred; and (vi) on whole, the record strongly suggests that on July 20, 2022 the disputed domain name was acquired by the registrar, Namecheap, perhaps via a drop catch or backorder purchase and held until it sold or transferred to the Respondent on February 18, 2025, resetting the registration date for the purposes of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Date of Respondent's Registration of the Disputed Domain Name

It is unclear when the Respondent became the registrant of the disputed domain name. The Whois records for the disputed domain name specify a creation date of July 20, 2022, with the identity of the registrant at that time redacted for privacy. At that time, the nameservers appear to have been parking name servers, typically used to display a placeholder page for an inactive domain name. The Whois records for the disputed domain name were updated on February 17, 2025. On February 18, 2025, the nameservers for the disputed domain name changed, and within a few months the disputed domain name resolved to a website that purported to offer an AI platform service similar to that offered by the Complainant under its trademark.

Section 3.9 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") states that, in cases where the domain name registration is masked by a privacy or proxy service and the complainant credibly alleges that a relevant change in registration has occurred, it would be incumbent on the respondent to provide satisfactory evidence of an unbroken chain of registration. The respondent's failure to do so in such circumstances has led panels to infer an attempt to conceal the true underlying registrant following a change in the relevant registration. Such an attempt may in certain cases form part of a broader scenario whereby application of UDRP paragraph 4(b)(iv), read in light of paragraph 4(a)(ii), can support an inference of bad faith registration for the respondent to rebut.

The Complainant made a strong argument that the update of the disputed domain name's registration coinciding with the change of name servers and subsequent use of the disputed domain name supports an interpretation that the Respondent became the registrant of the disputed domain name in February 2025. The Respondent did not challenge this interpretation of the facts, and indeed chose not to file any response to any of the Complainant's assertions.

The Complainant has credibly alleged, with supporting evidence, that a change in registration of the disputed domain name occurred in February 2025, at which time the Respondent became the registrant of it. In the absence of any denial of this by the Respondent, and based on the evidence currently before it, the Panel finds it more likely than not, for the purpose of this Complaint, that the Respondent became the registrant of the disputed domain name in February 2025, which is after the Complainant began using and first registered its OLLAMA trademark.

B. 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. It is the owner of a trademark registration for the word mark OLLAMA.

The entirety of the Complainant's word trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the addition only of the gTLD ".org". Once the gTLD is ignored (which is appropriate in this case), the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

C. 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 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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its OLLAMA trademark. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolved to a website that purported to offer an AI platform service similar to that offered by the Complainant under its trademark. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in this way unfairly took advantage of the Complainant's trademark for the Respondent's benefit. Such use of the disputed domain name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, and is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Accordingly, such use does not confer on the Respondent rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has not rebutted this. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

D. 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. While there was a disclaimer of association with the Complainant at the bottom of the Respondent's website, in the overall circumstances of this case that disclaimer could not have the effect of alleviating the confusion caused by the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

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 name <ollama.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew F. Christie/

Andrew F. Christie

Sole Panelist

Date: March 25, 2026