

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DNV AS v. Jamal Hosseini

Case No. D2026-0235

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DNV AS, Norway, represented by Zacco Norway AS, Norway.

The Respondent is Jamal Hosseini, Armenia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <dnv-korean.com>, <dnvkorean.com>, and <dnvu-korean.com> are registered with CSL Computer Service Langenbach GmbH dba Joker.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 21, 2026. On January 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 23, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 26, 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 26, 2026.

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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is a Norwegian-based, global company group known as a world-leading classification society and provider of services within the quality assurance and risk management industry. The company was founded in 1864 and today operates in more than 100 countries worldwide, with more than 15,400 employees

The Complainant is the registered owner of many trademarks consisting and/or containing "DNV" worldwide, United States of America trademark registration No. 6513761 DNV (word), registered on October 12, 2021 for goods and services in the classes 9, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41 and 42; European Union trademark registration No. 003326873, registered on January 10, 2005 for goods and services in the classes 9, 35 and 42.

Further, it uses the domain name <dnv.com> for its official website.

The disputed domain name <dnvu-korean.com> was registered on December 20, 2025; the disputed domain name <dnvkorean.com> was registered on January 5, 2026 and the disputed domain name <dnv-korean.com> was registered on December 10, 2025.

Further, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name <dnv-korean.com> resolved to a website allegedly offering Complainant's services and displaying without authorization the Complainant's trademark and logo. In addition, the website uses the Complainant's color scheme and logotype without the Complainant's authorization and the footer says "© DNV AS." In addition, on December 19, 2025, the Complainant sent - through the Registrar's contact form - a cease and desist letter to the Respondent in relation to the disputed domain name <dnv-korean.com> and the related website. The Respondent did not reply to it.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark since they wholly incorporate the Complainant's trademark DNV. In particular, the disputed domain names <dnvkorean.com> and <dnv-korean.com> include the Complainant's trademark DNV followed by the geographical indication "Korean", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The disputed domain name <dnvu-korean.com> includes the Complainant's trademark DNV followed by the letter "u" and the geographical indication "Korean". The adding of the letter "u" appears meaningless and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, no license or authorization of any kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent to register or use the mark DNV as a domain name or otherwise; neither is the Respondent an authorized representative of the Complainant's products or services and has never had a business relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent has intentionally chosen the disputed domain names based on the Complainant's trademark and fame, and to host a website that is designed to impersonate the Complainant's business, company and trademark. The website uses the Complainant's color scheme and logotype without authorization, and the footer says "© DNV AS." The Complainant argues that the Respondent is actively attempting to create the false impression that the disputed domain names and the website are somehow connected to or operated by the Complainant. This is further supported by the fact that on the website connected to the disputed domain name <dnv-korean.com>, there is no genuine information available about the Respondent, and there is no disclaimer present that accurately and prominently discloses the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant. Finally, the

registrant information does not correspond to the disputed domain names in any way, which are further circumstances indicating a lack of legitimate interest on part of the Respondent.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, given the widespread use, reputation and recognition of the DNV trademark and its related services and products, and the use of the disputed domain names, it is obvious that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant at the time of registration, and that it was the Complainant's business and trademark that motivated the Respondent to register and use the disputed domain names. The Respondent's purpose with the website is to intentionally create the false impression that the disputed domain names and website are affiliated with or operated by Complainant, for either commercial, illicit or fraudulent purposes. Furthermore, on December 19, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent. Despite this, the Respondent proceeded to register <dnvu-korean.com> and <dnvkorean.com> after having received the letter. Furthermore, before the filing of this Complaint, the Complainant has not received any reply to its notice. The Respondent, by registering and using the disputed domain names, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain or illicit purposes, Internet users to its own website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Furthermore, it appears that the Respondent has a history of registering domain names in bad faith. The Respondent appears in e.g. (*Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Jamal Hosseini*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1815](#) and *Instagram, LLC v. Jamal Hosseini*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2546](#)).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that each disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[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. The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term here, “korean” (and the vocal “u” in the disputed domain name <dnvu-korean.com>), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

In addition, it is the view of this Panel that the addition of the letter “u” in the disputed domain name <dnvu-korean.com> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark since the mark is clearly recognizable (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 1.9).

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 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.

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.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names contain the Complainant’s registered trademark DNV and a geographic term “korean”. The nature of these disputed domain names carry a risk of implied affiliation: in fact, geographic terms (e.g., <trademark-usa.com>, or <trademark.nyc>) are typically seen as tending to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 2.5.1.

Furthermore, the addition of the letter “u” in the disputed domain name <dnvu-korean.com> is likely to go unnoticed by Internet users, so that this Panel finds it most likely that the composition of the disputed domain name signals an intention on the part of the Respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant.

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 the present case, the Panel notes that it results from the Complainant’s evidence that the disputed domain name <dnv-korean.com> resolved to a website displaying the Complainant’s trademark and logo, and purportedly offering the Complainant’s services. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent positively knew the Complainant’s mark. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary,

the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain names included the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain names.

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.

On this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain names' registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith:

- (i) the nature of each disputed domain name (incorporating the Complainant's mark plus the addition of a geographical term);
- (ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name <dnv-korean.com> directed, displaying the Complainant's trademark, logo, and purportedly offering the Complainant's products;
- (iii) the timing and circumstances of the registration of the disputed domain names <dnvu-korean.com> and <dnvkorean.com> (i.e. after having received the C&D letter sent by the Complainant in relation to the disputed domain name <dnv-korean.com> and the related website;
- (iv) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain names;
- (v) the Respondent did not reply to the cease-and-desist letter;
- (vi) the Respondent concealing its identity through a privacy service.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain names <dnvu-korean.com> and <dnvkorean.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Finally, the Respondent has been involved in a number of trademark-abusive domain name registrations (i.e. *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Jamal Hosseini*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1815](#); *Instagram, LLC v. Jamal Hosseini*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2546](#)). In the view of the Panel, this behavior demonstrates a pattern of conduct by the Respondent of taking advantage of trademarks of third parties without any right to do so and is indicative of the Respondent's bad faith. Previous UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2. The Panel considers that this is the case here.

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 <dnv-korean.com>, <dnvkorean.com> and <dnvu-korean.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: March 9, 2026