

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

International Business Machines Corporation v. Perfso Tech, Perfso Technology
Case No. D2026-0640

1. The Parties

The Complainant is International Business Machines Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

The Respondent is Perfso Tech, Perfso Technology, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ibm2console.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 13, 2026. On February 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 16, 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 February 23, 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 23, 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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

Founded in 1911, the Complainant has long been active in the information technology sector, providing a broad array of products and services, including computers, computer hardware, software, and related programs. It is now recognized as one of the world's leading technology and consulting organizations, operating in over 175 countries. The Complainant promotes its business at the website "www.ibm.com".

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for "IBM" (the "IBM Trademarks"), including the following:

- The United States wordmark IBM, No. 1,694,814, registered on June 16, 1992, for services in class 36;
- The United States figurative trademark  No. 4,181,289, registered on July 31, 2012, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 28, 35, and 41; and
- The United States wordmark IBM, No. 1,243,930, registered on June 28, 1983, for services in class 42.

The acronym "IBM" refers to the Complainant's corporate name, namely "International Business Machines".

The disputed domain name was registered on August 19, 2025. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected Internet users to a website, displaying the IBM logo and providing access to an online wallet. As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive page.

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 is confusingly similar to trademarks in which it has established rights. In particular, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates its IBM Trademarks, with the mere addition of the number "2" and the term "console", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant further argues that the use of the term "console" in conjunction with its IBM Trademarks is likely to reinforce an association with the Complainant, notably in relation to its products and associated interfaces, thereby increasing the likelihood of confusion as to the relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the IBM Trademarks or to register a domain name incorporating them. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has intentionally sought to create a likelihood of confusion by incorporating the IBM Trademarks into the disputed domain name and using it to redirect Internet users to another website providing access to an online wallet. The Complainant further maintains that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. It also submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent. In particular, the Complainant submits that the incorporation of the IBM Trademarks together with the number “2” and the generic term “console” suggests an intention to refer to the Complainant’s products and their associated consoles. The Complainant further points out that the disputed domain name was registered at least 68 years after the registration of the IBM Trademarks and argues that, in light of the distinctiveness and reputation of its trademarks, it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users and redirect them to a website prompting access to a third-party link relating to a “wallet” application, allegedly associated with an illegitimate cryptocurrency service. Moreover, the Complainant submits that the fact that the disputed domain name is associated with active mail server records further supports a finding of bad faith registration and use, when considered in conjunction with the above circumstances.

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 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 name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “2” and “console” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

Indeed, it appears that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any permission to use the IBM Trademarks in the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Finally, it appears that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, given that as of the date of the Complaint, it was being used to redirect Internet users to another website, displaying the IBM logo and providing access to an electronic wallet.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the addition of the number "2" and the term "console" after the IBM Trademark in the disputed domain name may be perceived as referring to the quantity of the Complainant's products, thereby reinforcing the association with 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 the Respondent registered the disputed domain name well after the registration of the IBM Trademarks. Noting the distinctiveness and reputation of these trademarks, and given that the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the number "2" and the term "console", which may be perceived as related to the Complainant's business, the Panel considers that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks.

According to prior UDRP panel decisions, the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith (see section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)). Indeed, the Panel considers that it is established that the IBM Trademarks were registered and well known well before the registration of the disputed domain name. Given that as of the date of the Complaint, the disputed domain name was being used to redirect Internet users to another website, displaying the IBM logo and providing access to an electronic wallet, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by capitalizing on the fame of the IBM Trademarks.

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 <ibm2console.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/

Christiane Féral-Schuhl

Sole Panelist

Date: April 9, 2026