

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Elasticsearch B.V. v. Alexander Rymdeko-Harvey, Obscurity Labs LLC
Case No. D2026-0706

1. The Parties

The Complainant is elasticsearch B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Quinn IP Law, United States of America.

The Respondent is alexander rymdeko-harvey, Obscurity Labs LLC, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <elastic-support.com> is registered with Amazon Registrar, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 19, 2026. On February 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 20, 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 (On behalf of elastic-support.com owner) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 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 March 2, 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 March 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Anita Gerewal 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

Since 2012, the Complainant has operated under the corporate name “Elastic NV”, a company based in Amsterdam, the Netherlands (Kingdom of the). It actively uses the “Elastic” corporate name in its business operations and is publicly listed on the New York Stock Exchange under the ticker symbol ESTC. The Complainant provides an online platform focused on search-powered solutions, as well as services in observability and cybersecurity.

The Complainant owns over 155 formative trademark applications and registrations worldwide for ELASTIC, including the following:

- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 6263801 for the word mark ELASTIC in international classes 9 and 42, registered on February 9, 2021.

The Complainant also owns over 140 domain names that begin with or contain ELASTIC trademarks, including the generic Top-Level Domains such as <elastic.net>, <elastic.info>, <elastic.org>, <elastic.cloud>, <elasticsearch.com>, <elasticsearch.biz>, <elasticsearch.net> and <elasticsearch.org>, as well as prominent country code Top-Level Domains (“ccTLDs”) including, but not limited to the domain name <elastic.co>.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 25, 2024, and currently 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, utilizes the Complainant’s ELASTIC trademark as the primary and prominent term in the disputed domain name, in combination with the word “support”. The Respondent fully incorporates the Complainant’s well-known and distinctive ELASTIC trademark in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because (1) the Respondent is not affiliated with or licensed by the Complainant; (2) there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has a trademark registration for ELASTIC; (3) there is no evidence that the Respondent is making any fair use of the disputed domain name, in fact, evidence exists of the Respondent’s purposeful misuse of the Complainant’s rights; (4) there is evidence of the Complainant’s worldwide registration and use of the ELASTIC trademarks with the Complainant’s business resulting in the ELASTIC being famous and well-known marks; (5) there is evidence of the Complainant’s use of the ELASTIC trademark fully incorporated into the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute a fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's distinctive and well-known ELASTIC trademark, despite the Respondent having no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and not being commonly known by it. Given the longstanding global use and reputation of the Complainant's ELASTIC marks, the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's rights and instead deliberately sought to capitalize on its goodwill by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation, or endorsement. The registration postdates the Complainant's established trademark rights and appears intended to attract Internet users for commercial gain, including potential misuse such as phishing or other deceptive practices. Such conduct disrupts the Complainant's business, misleads consumers, and prevents the Complainant from reflecting its mark in a corresponding domain name, thereby evidencing bad faith under the Policy.

The Complainant has cited several prior decisions under the Policy involving the Complainant's ELASTIC trademark to support its Complaint.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 the ELASTIC trademark 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, "support" and a hyphen may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

In terms of the composition of the disputed domain name itself, prior UDRP panels have held that where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Panel finds that the combination of the Complainant’s ELASTIC trademark together with the term “support”, which is commonly associated with official customer or technical assistance, particularly in the technology sector in which the Complainant operates, may be understood as referring to a service provided by the Complainant. As such, it suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner and does not support a claim of fair use of the disputed domain name.

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 disputed domain name contains the Complainant’s well-known trademark in its entirety, and merely adds the generic term, “support”, connected with a hyphen. The inclusion of the Complainant’s well-known mark in its entirety in itself would be an indication that the Respondent must thus have known about the ELASTIC trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Further, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that is presently inactive.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the

Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <elastic-support.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anita Gerewal/

Anita Gerewal

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2026