

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

TeamSystem S.p.A. v. vishwjeet Jadeja, FOO MONK  
Case No. D2026-0912

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is TeamSystem S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is vishwjeet Jadeja, FOO MONK, United States of America (“United States”).

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <teamsystemai.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 3, 2026. On March 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 4, 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 Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 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 March 9, 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 March 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Jane Seager as the sole panelist in this matter on April 17, 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 company incorporated in 1987 in Pesaro, Italy. The Complainant operates in the information technology sector as a provider of digital business management solutions for companies and professionals, including management software, cloud-based and AI-enhanced digital platforms, and fintech solutions. The Complainant aids in the digitalization of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and professional firms in Italy and abroad.

The Complainant is the owner of, inter alia, the following trademark registrations:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 011642287, TS TEAMSYSTEM (figurative), registered on August 6, 2013;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 012783155, TEAMSYSTEM (figurative), registered on September 3, 2014; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 019144275 for TEAMSYSTEM (word mark), filed on February 18, 2025, registered on July 2, 2025.

The Complainant operates its primary website via the domain name <teamsystem.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 11, 2025. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active web page.

On December 30, 2025, the Complainant's representatives sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent (via the Registrar) as well as a registrant contact form notice. Reminders were sent by email on January 12, 2026, and on January 20, 2026; however, no reply was received.

#### **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 asserts rights in the TEAMSYSTEM trademark. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark as it incorporates the whole of the TEAMSYSTEM trademark, and the addition of the suffix "ai" (a common abbreviation for "Artificial Intelligence") does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent, or otherwise authorized to use the TEAMSYSTEM trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The addition of the letters "ai" creates a risk of implied affiliation between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, especially as AI is a core business area for the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The TEAMSYSTEM trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and is well known in the relevant sector. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent could not credibly claim to be unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time it registered the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name, combining the trademark with the letters "ai", suggests deliberate targeting of the Complainant. The Complainant submits that the passive holding of the disputed domain name, together with the configuration of MX records, which the Complainant asserts have potential for misleading email use, are evidence of bad faith. The Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's pre-Complaint communications and possible use of false contact details further support the argument of bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (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 was 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 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 "ai", 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.

As noted above, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active web page. The Panel finds that the non-use of the disputed domain name does not support a finding that the Respondent has used the

disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Nor is there any evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. The Panel notes “team system” are dictionary terms. But in the present case the Panel finds it significant that the disputed domain name combines “team system” with the acronym “ai” (an abbreviation for “Artificial Intelligence”, one of the Complainant’s core areas of business). Further, the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the top Google search results in the United States (the Respondent’s reported location) for the terms “team system” and “teamsystem” refer to the Complainant, and the Complainant has operated its official domain name <teamsystem.com> since at least 2004. The Panel finds that the extent of use of the Complainant’s mark in the technological field and its online presence are sufficient to infer, on the balance of probabilities, knowledge and intent to target the trademark value of the term on the part of the Respondent.

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

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

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.

The Complainant’s trademark TEAMSYSTEM is well known in the digital business management and AI sector, with trademark rights predating the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. As discussed above, the composition of the disputed domain name, which wholly incorporates the TEAMSYSTEM trademark together with the letters “ai” (ostensibly as a reference to artificial intelligence), being descriptive of one of the Complainant’s core activities, suggests that the Respondent was aware of and intended to target the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 that the Complainant’s trademark enjoys substantial reputation in its respective field of activity, the Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant’s pre-Complaint correspondence and did not come forward in the present proceedings. Further noting the composition of the disputed domain name itself, the Panel infers, on balance, that by registering the disputed domain name the Respondent intended to trade off the Complainant’s trademark rights. 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 <teamsystemai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Jane Seager/*

**Jane Seager**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 4, 2026