

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Seeh Finance and Investments SA v. pivotal.limited.hk, pivotal.limited.hk
Case No. D2026-0660

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Seeh Finance and Investments SA, Switzerland, represented by Etude Fontanet & Associés, Switzerland.

The Respondent is pivotal.limited.hk, pivotal.limited.hk, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <seehfinanceinvestment.com> is registered with Gransy, s.r.o. d/b/a subreg.cz (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 16, 2026. On February 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 19, 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 (unidentified) 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 23, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on April 7, 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 a Swiss private company registered in Geneva, Switzerland, since June 29, 2006. According to the Complainant's website, the Complainant is a family-owned company specializing in the shipping sector, and has a global presence through subsidiaries and strategic joint ventures.

The Complainant is the holder of several domain names incorporating its company name, including <seehfinance.ch>, registered on October 3, 2017 and three domain names transferred to the Complainant as the result of proceedings under the Policy. See, for example, <seehfinanceinvestment-ch.com> transferred to the Complainant on October 25, 2024, following the UDRP decision in *SEEH Finance and Investments SA v. Janna N Sopelnik*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3508](#).

The Complaint operates its official website at <seehfinance.ch>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 4, 2025.

The Respondent did not file a Response, so little information is known about the Respondent. According to the Registrar's records, the Respondent has an address in the United Kingdom.

At one time, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that was titled "Seeh Finance and Investments S.A." and that advertised services such as investment financing. The address that was provided on the website at the disputed domain name is an address in Geneva, Switzerland, very similar to the Complainant's one.

At the present time, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

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 summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions.

Notably, the Respondent created a copycat website at the disputed domain name that used the Complainant's legal name and an address in Geneva where the Complainant is located, and that promoted similar services to the Complainant's services.

The website at the disputed domain name is not legitimate. It includes numerous spelling mistakes, and it is doubtful whether the Respondent has the required FINMA (Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority) authorization.

The Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights in SEEH FINANCE AND INVESTMENTS.

The Respondent uses the Complainant's name to achieve a fraudulent objective.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (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 onus of proving these elements is on 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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights in SEEH FINANCE AND INVESTMENTS for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

In the Panel's assessment, the Complainant has adequately demonstrated that its unregistered mark SEEH FINANCE AND INVESTMENTS, which mirrors its registered business name, functions as a distinctive identifier of source. The mark is inherently distinctive and has been consistently used in commerce to designate the Complainant's services. The Complainant has also submitted undisputed evidence showing continuous use of the company name and business identifier since at least 2018, including in professional correspondence with banks, real estate professionals, notaries, payment and risk managers, asset managers, fund administrators, and public authorities in Switzerland. The Complainant has also been successful in establishing unregistered trademark rights in prior cases under the Policy.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the unregistered mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The differences between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark for SEEH FINANCE AND INVESTMENTS is that the word "and" and the final "s" are missing. These minor changes do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 website at the disputed domain name at one time was a website that appears to have been designed to confuse Internet users into believing that it is operated by the Complainant, when in fact it is not. The Complainant asserts that it was established for fraudulent purposes. Moreover, the Complainant states that the Respondent could not be providing the services in Switzerland as set out on the website at the disputed domain name because it is doubtful that Respondent holds the appropriate financial services license (e.g. with the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority FINMA.)

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, a claimed copycat site, or for passing off or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Respondent appears to be operating a website that is designed to confuse Internet users into believing that it is operated by the Complainant, when in fact it is not. The Complainant asserts that the website at the disputed domain name was designed to achieve a fraudulent objective. The Panel agrees that this is likely the case.

Clearly the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. *BV Law Firm TechLaB - Technology Law Boutique v. Venu Olis, Venu Olis*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3799](#).

The Complainant asserts that similar websites were created in 2022, 2023 and 2025 at other domain names, that were the subject of successful cases under the Policy. The Panel also notes that a website currently located at <seehfinanceinvestment.com.seedinvestment-uk.com> is substantially identical to the website that was located at disputed domain name, and that the domain name <seedinvestment-uk.com> is the subject of another pending dispute under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, a copycat site or other type of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. *Regal Funds Management Pty Limited v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / John Clerk*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2773](#).

The Panel also considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent's website or location.

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 <seehfinanceinvestment.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2026