

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Interop Digital Ltd. (INTEROP) v. Andrei Alifanov
Case No. D2026-0422

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Interop Digital Ltd. (INTEROP), Marshall Islands, represented by Estudio Carey Ltda., Chile.

The Respondent is Andrei Alifanov, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sabiotrade.org> is registered with Registrar of Domain Names REG.RU LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 2, 2026. On February 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 4, 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 (UNDISCLOSED REGISTRANT / Personal data, can not be publicly disclosed according to applicable laws) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant February 4, 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 February 4, 2026.

On February 4, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. On February 4, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Russian and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 3, 2026.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on March 9, 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 provides an online educational and trading platform, which provides users with resources to learn and practice trading. It is incorporated under the laws of the Marshall Islands.

The Complainant has registered numerous trademarks for the terms SABIOTRADE GET EDUCATED in South America including: Trademark Registration No. 3408210 in Argentina registered July 5, 2023, with expiration date June 29, 2033; Trademark Registration No. 715787 in Colombia on September 5, 2022, with expiration date of September 5, 2032; and Trademark Registration No. 1390449 in Chile registered on March 22, 2023, with expiration date March 13, 2033. To date the Complainant has offered its services by way of the website at "www.sabiotrade.com" which it owns and has operated since 2021.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 17, 2025. At the time of writing of this Decision the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, but previously it resolved to a shadow website that the Complainant claims was established for phishing purposes.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name comprises a single element, that being "sabiotrade", which reproduces the "core element" of the Complainant's trademark as registered in a number of South American countries. The Complainant adds that the website associated with the disputed domain name actively induces Internet users to conclude that it is associated with the Complainant, which it is not.

The Complainant says that the Respondent has never used the SABIOTRADE trademark and has no authorization from the Complainant to use the trademark or trade name SABIOTRADE. The first SABIOTRADE trademark was registered by the Complainant in March 2022, and the disputed domain name was registered in February 2025. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that replicates the distinctive elements of the Complainant's own website and contains links that redirect to a website at "www.qxbroker.com" which and would additionally be a direct competitor of the Complainant. This does not amount to fair use, according to the Complainant, and in any case the said website reproduces the Complainant's registered trademark without any authorization to do so. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent intends to do harm to and disrupt the Complainant's business, since Internet users would only realize they were not at the Complainant's genuine website after they had arrived at the Respondent's site, having been misled by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant adds that it is manifest that the Respondent knew about the Complainant's trademark rights. The Respondent clearly intended to impersonate the Complainant, the latter maintains, with false data and offers, and with a website that mimics that of the Complainant. The website to which the disputed

domain name resolves replicates individual elements and the look and feel of the Complainant's website. The disputed domain name was thus registered in bad faith, the Complainant concludes.

In terms of bad faith use, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that was clearly established for the purpose of phishing. The disputed domain name will trick Internet users into visiting it and also because of its similarity with the Complainant's trademark, domain name and site, it will disrupt and damage the Complainant's business, the Complainant asserts. The Complainant also points out that the Respondent through its actions has not followed the Registrar's terms and conditions, nor complied with other requirements under the UDRP.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue – Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name includes a term in English ("trade") and no Russian characters; the content of the website associated with the disputed domain name is written completely in English; and the website associated with the domain name <qxbroker.com>, to which the links in the disputed domain name website lead, is also expressed in English. Additionally, the Complainant says that communications with the Registrar regarding the abusive use of the disputed domain name were entirely conducted in English, and that although the Complainant's and its authorized representative's mother tongue is Spanish, the Complainant has been able to communicate with all involved parties in English and provide accurate translations of Spanish language documents as required.

Although the Respondent was notified of the Complaint and received communications regarding the proceedings in both Russian and English, the Respondent has not replied to any contentions of the Complainant nor made any submission about the language of the proceedings. In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel takes into account both parties' likely ability to understand and use the proposed language, and the delay and costs that would be occasioned to the Complainant if the proceedings were conducted in Russian (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 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. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with the registered trademark of the Complainant. Although that mark SABIOTRADE GET EDUCATED is not replicated in its totality in the disputed domain name, the distinctive, recognizable, and easily recalled part of the mark, that being the term “SABIOTRADE”, is present in its entirety in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain name previously pointed to a shadow website which mimicked the appearance of the Complainant’s official site and, without permission, replicated its registered trademark and distinctive device. It also provided links to the website at “www.qxbroker.com” which offers competing services to those of the Complainant. The inference that can be drawn from the Complainant’s uncontested contentions is that the purpose of this undertaking by the Respondent appears to have been to engage in phishing. Such an activity which relies on the deception of Internet users, is not of a kind that gives rise to legitimate interests or rights.

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 the Respondent registered a domain name the composition of which clearly indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s activities and trademark rights at the time. The inclusion of the distinctive term “sabiobrade”, in which the Complainant has rights both by way of its trademark registration and its use of the domain name <sabiobrade.com> for its online training activities, clearly indicates the Respondent’s knowledge at the time of registration. That inference is further strengthened by the fact that the disputed domain name linked to a website which mimicked that of the Complainant and included unauthorized replications of the latter’s registered trademark.

In reality that site was on the balance of probabilities established to enable the illegal activities of the Respondent. The Respondent seeks to deceive Internet users by its registration and use of the disputed domain name, and trick them to its own benefit and their loss. That no website is at present accessible by way of the disputed domain name does not detract from the bad faith use indicated by the previous use.

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 <sabiotrade.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: March 23, 2026