

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Revantage Corporate Services, LLC v. Revantage Real Estate Brokerage Case No. D2026-0583

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Revantage Corporate Services, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Taylor Wessing LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Revantage Real Estate Brokerage, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <revantagedxb.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 11, 2026. On February 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 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 (Revantage Real Estate) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 13, 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 17, 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 February 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Gonalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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 is Revantage Corporate Services, LLC, a company based in the United States of America. The Complainant was founded in 2017 and provides corporate services to real estate portfolio companies and investments, including property management, accounting, tax and legal services. The Complainant operates globally, supporting real estate assets across multiple jurisdictions worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark REVANTAGE in several jurisdictions. For the purposes of this proceeding, the Panel notes in particular the following registrations:

United States Trademark Registration No. 6091353 for REVANTAGE, registered on June 30, 2020, with an application date of June 21, 2017;

European Union Trademark Registration No. 017623621 for REVANTAGE, registered on May 2, 2018, with an application date of December 20, 2017;

United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00917623621 for REVANTAGE, registered on May 2, 2018, with an application date of December 20, 2017.

The Complainant also owns a portfolio of domain names incorporating the REVANTAGE mark and uses the mark in connection with its corporate and real estate-related services.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 25, 2024. The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering real estate services in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, under the name “Revantage Real Estate”. The website prominently displays the term “REVANTAGE” and offers services in the field of real estate. The website also displayed the email address [...]@revantage.com, which corresponds to the Complainant’s domain name <revantage.com>. The Complainant attempted to send an email to this email address; however, the message was undeliverable.

The Respondent appears to operate under the name “Revantage Real Estate Brokerage”, with an address in Dubai. There is no evidence in the record of any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, nor of any authorization granted to the Respondent to use the Complainant’s REVANTAGE mark.

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. In particular, the Complainant argues that:

1. the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s REVANTAGE trademark in its entirety;
2. the addition of the term “dxb” does not distinguish the disputed domain name, as it is a commonly recognized abbreviation for Dubai, being the apparent location of the Respondent;
3. the disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant’s REVANTAGE trademark and creates a risk of confusion among Internet users;
4. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
5. the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its REVANTAGE trademark;
6. the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to operate a website offering real estate services under the name “Revantage Real Estate”;

7. the Respondent prominently displays the term “REVANTAGE”, which is identical to the Complainant’s trademark, in connection with services in the same field of activity as the Complainant;
8. such use creates the impression that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant;
9. the Respondent’s website displayed the email address [...]@revantage.com, which corresponds to the Complainant’s domain name;
10. this further increases the likelihood of confusion and demonstrates an intent to mislead Internet users;
11. the Respondent registered the disputed domain name well after the Complainant had established trademark rights in the REVANTAGE mark;
12. the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration;
13. the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith;
14. the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark REVANTAGE.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s REVANTAGE mark in its entirety. The addition of the term “dxb”, which is a common abbreviation for Dubai, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Panel finds that 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”. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering real estate services under the name "Revantage Real Estate", prominently displaying the term "REVANTAGE", which is identical to the Complainant's trademark, and offering services in the same field of activity as the Complainant. The website also displayed the email address [...]@revantage.com, which corresponds to the Complainant's domain name.

In the Panel's view, such use of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's trademark and is used in connection with a website offering related services in a manner that suggests an affiliation with the Complainant, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation or passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out circumstances which, 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 the disputed domain name well after the Complainant had established trademark rights in the REVANTAGE mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety and resolves to a website offering real estate services under the name "Revantage Real Estate", using the Complainant's mark in connection with services in the same field of activity.

The Panel further notes that the website associated with the disputed domain name displayed the email address [...]@revantage.com, which corresponds to the Complainant's domain name, thereby increasing the likelihood that Internet users would believe that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant.

In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for impersonation or passing off constitutes bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <revantagedxb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira/

Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026