ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
OLLAMA INC. v. Erdy Yudanto
Case No. D2026-0985

1. The Parties

The Complainant is OLLAMA INC., Canada, represented by Coates IP LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Erdy Yudanto, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ollama.digital> 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 6, 2026. On March 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 9, 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 (UNKNOWN RESPONDENT) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 10, 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 14, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Angelica Lodigiani as the sole panelist in this matter on April 16, 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 Canadian corporation offering software that enables users to run large language AI models directly on their own devices, rather than transmitting data to cloud-based servers. The Complainant provides a model library with ready-to-run model files with a simple prompt / chat interface. It also offers GPU acceleration and can operate offline. The Complainant has partnered with large technology companies for service integration and support, among other services.

At the time of the filing of this UDRP proceeding, the Complainant was the owner of at least the following registered marks:

- OLLAMA (word), United Kingdom registration No. 3991401, filed on December 12, 2023, and registered on April 5, 2024, for goods and services in classes 9, 25, ,28 and 42;

- OLLAMA (word), European Union registration No. 18962369, filed on December 12, 2023, and registered on October 31, 2024, for goods and services in classes 9, 25, ,26, 28 and 42;

- OLLAMA (word), Taiwanese registration No. 02473413, filed on June 3, 2024, and registered on August 1, 2025, for goods and services in classes 9, 25, ,28 and 42.

Moreover, the Complainant is the owner of other trademark applications in other countries, including the United States of America and Canada, all filed before the date of registration of the disputed domain name, but still at the application date. The Complainant affirms that it enjoys common law rights in the OLLAMA mark, which has been used in commerce since August 1, 2023.

Finally, the Complainant is the owner of the below figurative trademark , registered in several countries for the same goods and services for which the OLLAMA mark has been registered (the “Logo”).



The Complainant operates the domain name <ollama.com>, resolving to its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 24, 2026, allegedly by an individual located in Indonesia. The Respondent appears to be the business owner, CEO and founder of “Dominiac Digital”, claiming to be a digital marketing agency specializing in search engine optimization (SEO). The Respondent also owns and operates the website “www.rankgasm.com”, which purports to offer marketing services and is indicated as a “digital marketing agency specializing in SEO, including audits, optimization, content, technical SEO, and link building” on the Crunchbase platform. However, the Respondent's website at “www.rankgasm.com”, appears to be an online gaming site promoting an alleged partnership with Neraka189, an unrelated online gambling platform, and offering an “official” login and link to this platform.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website featuring the Complainant's OLLAMA mark and Logo and offering cryptocurrency tokens under the Complainant's OLLAMA 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's OLLAMA mark, as it reproduces it entirely with the sole addition of the generic Top-Level domain ".online", which is a mere technical requirement and has no impact on a similarity analysis for the purpose of the Policy.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no rights in the Complainant's OLLAMA mark; it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and does not own any trademark registration for OLLAMA. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website depicting the Complainant's OLLAMA mark and Logo and offering a cryptocurrency token under the OLLAMA mark. The Respondent has named its token "OLLAMA" and displays it on its website with a cashtag. The website also displays the "OLLAMA" token SPL, inviting users to copy the contract address for use in acquiring and trading the token on a blockchain platform. According to the Respondent's website, the "OLLAMA" token is live and in trade.

The Complainant further contends that, through the disputed domain name, the Respondent is creating a false association with the Complainant and is seeking to mislead consumers and capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill. The Respondent describes its product as "open-model" and giving this term prominent placement on the homepage of its website, in the exact position in which the Complainant references its own open-model integration tools. The website includes a link to the Complainant's "X" account, which features the Complainant's OLLAMA mark and Logo. The website also links the Respondent's profile on a well-known trading platform, depicting the Complainant's mark in trading view charts and in the platform's sidebar. This sidebar also displays representations of the Complainant's Logo engaged in different activities. Further linkbacks on the platform resolve to the Respondent's website at the disputed domain name and its "X" account.

Accordingly, the Respondent is attempting to mislead consumers by representing a false affiliation, source, sponsorship or endorsement between the Complainant's marks and the Respondent's cryptocurrency token in order to attract traffic, users and traders to its website and token. Such use of the disputed domain name does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith for the following reasons.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's OLLAMA mark. The OLLAMA mark is distinctive and uniquely associated with the Complainant. The mere registration of a domain name that is identical to a distinctive and widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

It is inconceivable that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant's OLLAMA mark and Logo. Moreover, the Respondent's website includes links to its "X" account and to a well-known cryptocurrency platform featuring the Complainant's marks. Furthermore, the Respondent has copied on its "X" account the Complainant's Logo wearing headphones and sunglasses, which was displayed on the Complainant's website during the holiday period. Finally, the Respondent's website footer features a link to the Complainant's official page on one of the largest software development collaboration platforms, alongside the Complainant's Logo.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name clearly gives the impression that it is connected to the Complainant. It misrepresents the source of its products to create a false association with the Complainant, deliberately attempting to exploit and freeride on the goodwill of the Complainant's marks to attract Internet users to its website for its own economic advantage.

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. In particular, the Complainant has shown that it owns rights over the registered trademark OLLAMA, which predates the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to reflect its mark in the disputed domain name or to make use of such mark in any other manner whatsoever. Nothing in the case file shows that the Respondent might have been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

A respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner; the correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often the central starting point to this inquiry. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5. Domain names identical to a complainant's trademark, like in the case at issue, carry a high risk of implied affiliation.

The Panel further notes that the use being made by the Respondent of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to resolve a misleading website featuring the Complainant's OLLAMA mark and Logo and offering a cryptocurrency token under such mark and Logo. The home page of the Respondent's website identifies its product as "open model" in the same manner as the Complainant when referring to its "open model" integration tools. In both cases, these references are placed at the center of the home page below the depiction of the Logo.

Moreover, the website associated with the disputed domain name contains links to the Respondent's "X" account and to the Respondent's profile on a well-known cryptocurrency monitoring platform, both of which display the Complainant's marks and a version of the Complainant's Logo character used by the Complainant during the holiday season. The footer of the Respondent's website further features a link to the Complainant's official page on one of the largest software development collaboration platforms alongside the Complainant's Logo.

Accordingly, the Respondent is creating the false impression that its website is owned and operated by the Complainant. It is therefore clear to the Panel that the disputed domain name gives rise to an impermissible risk of user confusion through impersonation. By means of the disputed domain name, the Respondent is misleadingly diverting consumers to its website for illegitimate commercial gain.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including impersonation and passing off 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

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 OLLAMA mark is distinctive and that appears to be exclusively associated with the Complainant. The Panel is of the view that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and of its OLLAMA mark when it registered the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark. Moreover, the OLLAMA mark and the Logo are consistently reproduced on the Respondent's website, on its "X" account and on a well-known trading platform, both of which link to the Respondent's website. Such website is also linked to the Complainant official page on one of the largest software development collaboration platforms, alongside the Complainant's Logo. The registration of a domain name incorporating a third party's mark with knowledge of such mark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests constitutes registration in bad faith.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to promote a cryptocurrency token under the Complainant's OLLAMA mark. To do so, the Respondent has created a misleading website, which provides the false impression that it originates from the Complainant, whereas in fact it does not.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity including impersonation and *passing off* constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

In light of the overall circumstances of this case, as discussed above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other on-line 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 offered thereon.

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 <ollama.digital> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angelica Lodigiani/
Angelica Lodigiani
Sole Panelist
Date: April 23, 2026