ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Capte Holding B.V. v. Domain Administrator, NameFind LLC
Case No. D2026-0455

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Capte Holding B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), internally represented.

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, NameFind LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Levine Samuel, LLP, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <capte.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 4, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 5, 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 February 6, 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 February 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the original due date for Response was March 3, 2026. At the request of the Respondent, the due date for Response was extended to March 7, 2026 in accordance with Paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. The Response was filed with the Center on March 3, 2026. On March 4, 2026, the Complainant requested leave to make a supplemental filing.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy, David H. Bernstein, and Andrew D. S. Lothian as panelists in this matter on March 23, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 24, 2026, the Complainant reiterated its request for leave to make a supplemental filing. On March 26, 2026, the Panel issued Panel Procedural Order No. 1 (the "Panel Order") in which it invited (a) the Complainant to submit additional evidence demonstrating commercial use of the CAPTE mark prior to 2020; (b) the Respondent to clarify the precise nature of the transaction involving the disputed domain name in or about March 2020; and (c) each Party to comment on the other's supplemental filing only. The due date for the Parties' submissions in response to the Panel Order was March 31, 2026 and the due date for the Parties' comments on each other's submission was April 5, 2026. The due date for the Decision was extended to April 11, 2026.

On March 27, 2026, the Complainant made a supplemental filing in response to the Panel Order. On March 30, 2026, the Respondent made a supplemental filing in response to the Panel Order. On April 2 and 3, 2026, the Complainant and the Respondent each submitted comments on the other's supplemental filing.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Dutch company established on July 20, 2017 that offers telematics solutions for fleet management and public transportation. It holds European Union trademark registration number 019219745 for a figurative CAPTE mark, registered on November 7, 2025 (application filed on July 17, 2025), specifying telematic apparatus and other goods and services in classes 9, 12, 35, 38, 39, and 42. That trademark registration is current. The Complainant uses the domain name <capte.co> for email and in connection with a website.

The Respondent is a company based in the United States that acquires and resells domain names. It is owned by the Registrar.

The disputed domain name was originally created on December 25, 2004. From at least February 5, 2008, it was held by Name Administration Inc. (BVI), a company related to Uniregistry, a domain name registrar. On February 11, 2020, the Registrar announced that it was acquiring Uniregistry, together with Uniregistry's portfolio of domain names. On March 18, 2020, the disputed domain name was still registered with Uniregistry but the registration had been transferred to NameFind Cayman Islands Ltd, which appears to be a company related to the Respondent (i.e., NameFind LLC of the United States). The disputed domain name is now registered with the Registrar and held by the Respondent.

On November 7, 2025, in response to an expression of interest in the disputed domain name, the Registrar sent an email communication to the Complainant advising that the seller had set the asking price at USD 11,499. On November 10, 2025, the Complainant contacted the Respondent, giving notice of its European Union trademark registration, requesting a transfer of the disputed domain name, and threatening to initiate a UDRP proceeding. On November 13, 2025, the Respondent replied, declining to transfer the disputed domain name, which it noted had been registered before the Complainant's trademark. On November 15, 2025, the Complainant asserted common law trademark rights based on documented commercial use of the CAPTE name since 2016, and also enquired about a purchase price for the disputed domain name prior to initiating a UDRP proceeding. On November 18, 2025, the Respondent reiterated that there was no infringement because the disputed domain name predated the trademark, and asking to continue negotiations. On the same day, the Registrar replied to an enquiry from the Complainant regarding the disputed domain name, advising that the asking price had been set at USD 11,499. On December 9, 2025, the Complainant offered USD 1,500 for a transfer of the disputed domain name. On the following day, the Registrar advised that the seller declined the Complainant's offer.

As at December 14, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a landing page configured to display Pay-Per-Click links, although no such links were displayed. A banner on the landing page read “Click here to Buy capte.com as your website name or call” followed by a telephone number. The same contact telephone number appears in an advertisement offering the disputed domain name for sale on a Sports website. The disputed domain name is also listed for auction by the Registrar with a price of USD 34,999 to “buy now”.

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 it has used the CAPTE mark continuously in commerce since 2017 in connection with telematics solutions for fleet management and public transportation. It owns a European Union trademark registration for CAPTE. The disputed domain name is identical to its CAPTE trademark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant and has never been authorized to use the CAPTE mark.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the name “Capte”. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website offering bona fide goods or services and has been passively held.

The Complainant recognizes that the disputed domain name was originally created in 2004, prior to the Complainant’s trademark registration in 2025 and the establishment of the CAPTE group of companies in 2017. However, a transfer or other change in control of a domain name to a different holder may constitute a new registration for purposes of assessing bad faith. To the extent that the Panel finds that the Respondent’s control of the disputed domain name reflects such a transfer or change in control, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

In any case, the Respondent’s current conduct demonstrates bad faith use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s distinctive CAPTE trademark and has no dictionary or descriptive meaning in English or Dutch. Instead, it resolves to a commercial landing page that displays third party advertising content and prominently solicits the purchase of the disputed domain name. It is offered for sale for USD 11,499, a price far exceeding any reasonable out-of-pocket registration or maintenance costs. In addition, it is offered for auction on a broker’s website for USD 34,999. Use of a domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with a complainant’s mark constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent’s conduct demonstrates an intent to derive commercial gain from the trademark value of the disputed domain name rather than from any independent or legitimate meaning. Such conduct - including monetized parking, use of privacy services, and offering the disputed domain name for sale at a substantial price - is consistent with abusive domain name practices and intentional exploitation of trademark value. Even in the absence of an active website, bad faith use may be found based on the totality of the circumstances.

In its supplemental filing, the Complainant provides evidence purporting to show that the CAPTE mark was used in commerce prior to 2020. It comments that the Panel may consider the Respondent’s acquisition of control of the disputed domain name in 2020 as the relevant point in time for assessing the Respondent’s conduct, or at minimum as a material factor in that assessment. It further comments that the Respondent’s holding of the disputed domain name solely for resale reflects a business model that targets the value of such terms.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent contends that, while the Complainant has standing based on its 2025 trademark registration, it disputes that the Complainant has any common law rights dating to the formation of its business. While "Capte" may have no dictionary meaning in Dutch, that does not mean it is unique or lacks meaning in other languages. The Complainant is one of many others who own a trademark for the term CAPTE. The Complainant cannot have created the linguistic construction "Capte" because the disputed domain name dates from 2004, and is a registered trademark in the United States as an acronym for "Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education". The Complainant's current visibility appears limited to its own website and LinkedIn profile. The Complainant has no actionable claim for cybersquatting as its trademark postdated the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has not made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. It simply assumes this to be a fact because the Respondent passively holds the disputed domain name and offered it for sale in advancement of its lawful business. In 2020, the Registrar acquired Uniregistry and its founder's portfolio of domain names. The registry simply continued under the Registrar's imprimatur and the Respondent replaced Uniregistry's domain name holding company. The acquisition constituted a continuation of that business under different management. It is unimportant why the disputed domain name was acquired in 2008; the CAPTE trademark is common and cannot be associated exclusively with any one holder. "Capte" may be a neologism; it is also a French word. There has been an unbroken chain of possession since the Registrar acquired and merged the prior owner and its portfolio into its own business, with the portfolio administered by the Respondent. The transfers of the disputed domain name between commonly-controlled entities did not extinguish pre-existing rights or legitimate interests in it. The Respondent does not lose the earlier date of acquisition in 2008 as it stands in the former owner's shoes.

The Complainant places no evidence before the Panel that could support a supposition of cybersquatting. How the Respondent could have known about the Complainant in 2020 or even later is a mystery. How could a minor business in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the) operating a niche business have come to the Respondent's attention at any time except when it suddenly issues a letter of demand? There is no evidence demonstrating that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant or had the Complainant specifically "in mind" when it registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant offers no evidence of any reputation that it might have had in 2020 even in its home base in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the), let alone in the United States. Where a respondent offers a domain name from its inventory to "anyone", without knowledge of an unregistered complainant, there can be no basis in law for accusing it of cybersquatting. The concept that a reseller of generic domain names is in violation of the UDRP for alleged "excessive pricing" has long been rejected. The Complainant also cites paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy but musters no supporting argument or evidence.

The Respondent requests the Panel to make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. It submits that the Complainant commenced this summary proceeding knowing that it lacked any evidence of cybersquatting and based purely upon supposition.

In its supplemental filing, the Registrar's Vice-President, Domain Investor Sales and Care, declares that, when the Registrar acquired Name Administration Inc. and its portfolio of domain names, the Registrar was essentially stepping into the shoes of Uniregistry and its owner. The staffs of these businesses transitioned to the Registrar, including the brokerage team. The Respondent was substituted for Name Administration Inc., not as a new registrant but as its successor. The Complainant's supplemental filing provides evidence that it pitched itself at exhibitions to a very niche audience, and made one insignificant sale, but omits its website content or traffic data.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Complainant's Request for Leave to Submit a Supplemental Filing

On the day after the Response was filed, the Complainant requested leave to submit a short supplemental filing in reply to factual assertions in the Response (a) that the Complainant lacked reputation, market presence, or common law trademark rights prior to the registration of its trademark in 2025; and (b) regarding the portfolio acquisition in 2020. Specifically, the Complainant sought to submit evidence of commercial use of its CAPTE mark prior to 2020. The Complainant reiterated its request on the day after the appointment of the Panel.

The Complainant argued that the assertions in the Response regarding these matters could not reasonably have been anticipated at the time of filing of the Complaint. The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 12 of the Rules provides that, "[i]n addition to the complaint and the response, the Panel may request, in its sole discretion, further statements or documents from either of the Parties". At the same time, paragraphs 10(b) and (c) of the Rules require the Panel to ensure that "the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case" and that "the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition".

The Panel agrees that, at the time when the Complaint was filed, the Complainant could not reasonably have been expected to be aware of the information in the Response surrounding the transfer of the disputed domain name, which is a material issue in this dispute. Accordingly, the Panel issued the Panel Order inviting both Parties to make supplemental filings with respect to certain specific matters, and giving each an opportunity to comment on the other's supplemental filing.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must demonstrate each of the following elements:

(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.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of the CAPTE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. Those rights existed at the time when the Complaint was filed, which is the relevant time for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.1.3 and 1.2.1.

The Complainant also alleges that it has used the CAPTE mark continuously in commerce since 2017 in connection with telematics solutions for fleet management and public transportation. Read in light of the Complainant's email to the Respondent dated November 15, 2025, the Panel understands this to be a claim of unregistered or common law trademark rights. That understanding was confirmed by the Complainant's

request to submit a supplemental filing. In order to establish unregistered trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy, a complainant must show that its mark has become a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with its goods and/or services. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.3. In the present case, the evidence submitted in support of this claim consists of (i) a commercial register extract showing that the Complainant was established in 2017; (ii) confirmation of the Complainant's presence at three transport industry exhibitions in Paris and Lyon (in France) and Birmingham (in the United Kingdom) in 2017 (but not showing how its mark was used at those exhibitions); (iii) an invoice for a small amount to a single client in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the) in 2018; and (iv) indirect evidence from the Internet Archive of the existence of the domain name <capte.co> since 2016 (including prior to the Complainant's establishment) without screenshots of any associated website. There is no evidence from 2019 onwards. While this evidence shows that the Complainant was operational from its establishment in 2017, it is insufficient to show that the CAPTE mark was actively in use in commerce in a way that it had become a distinctive identifier that consumers associated with its goods and/or services prior to the registration of that mark in 2025. Accordingly, the Panel does not find, on the record submitted, that the Complainant has established unregistered trademark rights at any period prior to 2025 for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel will continue its assessment by comparing the disputed domain name with the registered CAPTE mark. The entirety of the CAPTE mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The only additional element in the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Design elements, such as, here, the logo component and typeface stylization of the Complainant's mark, are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element, and the focus of such assessment is on the non-design (textual) elements. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the CAPTE mark for the purposes of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7, 1.10, and 1.11.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds, by a majority, that it is unnecessary to consider this element in light of the Panel's conclusion in relation to bad faith in Section 6.2C below. Panelist Bernstein disagrees, for the reasons set out in Section 8 below.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy contains two requirements that apply conjunctively. A complainant must show both that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith and also that it is being used in bad faith. The former requires a demonstration that the Respondent knew, or should have known, of the Complainant and/or the Complainant's trademark at the time when it registered or acquired the disputed domain name and that it registered the disputed domain name with a bad faith intention targeting the Complainant and/or its mark.

The Panel will assess bad faith registration in light of the circumstances prevailing on the date on which the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name from an unrelated entity, unless the Respondent provides satisfactory evidence of an unbroken chain of possession from a prior date, subject to no more than "formal" changes or updates to registrant contact information in the meantime. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.9.

In the present case, the date on which the Respondent (i.e., NameFind LLC) acquired the disputed domain name is unknown but a company apparently related to the Respondent (i.e., NameFind Cayman Islands Ltd) acquired the disputed domain name from an unrelated entity by no later than March 18, 2020. It is not contested that these NameFind companies are under the common control of the Registrar, and there is no allegation that the subsequent transfer of the disputed domain name to the Respondent was to evade the application of the Policy. However, the Respondent argues that there has been an unbroken chain of possession of the disputed domain name stretching back as far as 2008, when the disputed domain name

was acquired by the founder of Uniregistry. The Respondent argues that the 2020 transfer from a Uniregistry company to a NameFind company did not break the chain of possession.

The Panel notes that the limited record does not disclose the precise nature of the 2020 transaction, and the Respondent provided very little new information regarding that issue when invited to do so by the Panel Order.

The Respondent argues simultaneously that the Registrar's acquisition of Uniregistry and its domain name portfolio constituted a continuation of Uniregistry's business, but under different management, and that the parties' domain name portfolios were merged. This suggests that the Registrar assumed control over the assets in Uniregistry's portfolio as part of its own business. Indeed, Uniregistry's former website address now redirects to the Registrar's website. [1] Based on this record, the Respondent has not provided satisfactory evidence of an unbroken chain of possession prior to 2020. Therefore, the Panel will assess bad faith registration in light of the circumstances prevailing as at the date of acquisition on March 18, 2020.

The disputed domain name was acquired by a company apparently related to the Respondent at least five years before the registration of the Complainant's CAPTE trademark in December 2025. Where a respondent registers a domain name before the complainant's trademark rights accrue, UDRP panels will not normally find bad faith registration on the part of the respondent. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.8.1.

The Panel has considered the possibility that there may be exceptional circumstances that would establish that the Respondent's intent in acquiring the disputed domain name in the present case was to unfairly capitalize on the Complainant's nascent trademark rights. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.8.2. However, the evidence merely shows that the Complainant was operational in 2017-2018, in a particular industrial sector in Europe and the United Kingdom, whereas the Respondent is based in the United States (with a presence in the Cayman Islands). There is very little evidence of the Complainant's Internet presence. The CAPTE mark is distinctive but textually identical to several third-party trademarks. In sum, these circumstances do not indicate on the balance of probabilities that the Complainant's CAPTE mark was being targeted by the Respondent at the point when the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in 2020.

The Complainant emphasizes the fact that the Respondent merely offers the disputed domain name for sale for a substantial price. However, no circumstances have been drawn to the Panel's attention from which the inference could be drawn that this offer indicates any targeting of the Complainant's mark, let alone at the time of acquisition of the disputed domain name years prior. Moreover, generally speaking, prior UDRP panels have found that the practice as such of registering a domain name for subsequent resale (including for a profit) would not by itself support a claim that the respondent registered the domain name in bad faith with the primary purpose of selling to a trademark owner or its competitor. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.1.

Based on the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name in bad faith targeting of the Complainant or its trademark rights because the Complainant had no trademark rights at the time when the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to

[1] The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has visited the webpage associated with the Uniregistry website address listed in the 2020 press release annexed to the Response (www.uniregistry.com), to verify the Respondent's allegation regarding the continuation of the Uniregistry business. The Panel considers this process of verification useful in assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.8.

harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.16.

The Respondent requests the Panel to make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. It submits that the Complainant commenced this summary proceeding knowing that it lacked any evidence of cybersquatting and based purely upon supposition

In the Panel's view, the Complainant has not presented a compelling case and produced only limited evidence of its reputation. However, that does not mean that the Complainant initiated this proceeding knowing that it could not succeed. The Complainant was established under the distinctive "Capte" name years prior to the acquisition of the disputed domain name by a NameFind company. Therefore, the Panel does not find that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith or that it constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Matthew Kennedy/
Matthew Kennedy
Presiding Panelist

/David H. Bernstein/
David H. Bernstein
Panelist

/Andew D.S. Lothian/
Andrew D. S. Lothian
Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026

8. Separate Concurring Opinion Regarding Rights or Legitimate Interests

Panelist Bernstein would reach the question of rights or legitimate interests in light of the Respondent's request for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. That is because, in assessing whether the Complaint was brought in bad faith, the Panel should consider the potential strength of each of the UDRP factors. The fact that the Complainant succeeded on the second element (in this Panelist's view) informs this Panelist's decision on why a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking is not warranted in this case.

Briefly, Panelist Bernstein would find that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, and that the Respondent has not rebutted that showing. The Respondent has not offered any credible explanation for why its predecessor in interest registered the disputed domain name, or why it acquired and reregistered the disputed domain name in 2020, other than to baldly state that it was registered in connection with a business of investing in domain names. Although the registration of domain names for investment and resale can constitute a legitimate interest, that is typically an accepted rationale when the domain names correspond to acronyms, dictionary words, common phrases,

or unique/catchy or memorable terms, and they are being registered for those purposes (and not to take advantage of trademark rights). See, e.g., WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1. The Respondent has not shown that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for any of those reasons.

After the fact, the Respondent notes today that the disputed domain name corresponds to a number of other trademarks, and to an acronym for Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education, and corresponds to the closely related French word capté (or capte, with or without accent), but the Respondent does not argue that any of those were rationales at the time for the registration of this domain name. Indeed, if the rationale was that CAPTE corresponded to other trademarks, that would show that the Respondent did not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (even if, as the Panel has found, there was no bad faith targeting of the Complainant's trademark).

Tellingly, the Respondent disclaims any basis for why it or its predecessor in interest believed this to be an appropriate domain name for investment. It goes so far as to argue that "[i]t is unimportant" why the disputed domain name was registered – whether because it was a neologism (though there is no evidence in the record that it is a neologism), or a French word, or because it was just a five-letter string in a domain name that had been previously registered by another party in 2004. When the burden of production is on the respondent to come forward with evidence to rebut a prima facie showing that that the respondent lacked rights or legitimate interests, the Panel expects the respondent to come forward with evidence, not to simply say that its rationale in acquiring the disputed domain name does not matter. The mere fact that some other party registered the disputed domain name earlier in time does not automatically give the Respondent rights or legitimate interests at the time when it acquired the disputed domain name many years later.
It may well be that the Respondent had a legitimate basis for the registration of this domain name at the time of registration, but the Respondent has not put forward evidence in this proceeding to explain or justify that position. For that reason, I would reach the question of rights or legitimate interests, and would find, on this record, that the Complainant has shown that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.