

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jema Africa Limited v. Dan Johnson IV
Case No. D2026-1214

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jema Africa Limited, United Republic of Tanzania, represented by Adlex Solicitors, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Dan Johnson IV, Japan, self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <jemafrica.me>, <jemafrica.net>, <jemafrica.org>, and <jemafrica.pro> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 20, 2026. On March 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 23, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 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 amended Complaint on March 24, 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 14, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on March 30, 2026. On March 31, 2026, the Respondent made a supplemental filing.

The Center appointed Warwick A. Rothnie, David H. Bernstein, and Matthew Kennedy as panelists in this matter on April 22, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 mining company which was incorporated in Tanzania in 2012. Together with its related companies, the Complainant engages in mining activities, mineral processing, chemical supply and the provision of logistics and transportation services across Africa.

The Respondent and one of the current directors, who is also the CEO, were the founders and original directors and shareholders of the Complainant. They are also brothers-in-law.

The Complaint includes evidence that the Complainant generated revenues as follows:

Financial Year	Revenue (USD)
2022	12.6 million
2023	16.6 million
2024	21.7 million

Since about 2019 the Complainant has promoted its business and services from a website at “www.jemafrica.co.tz”. The website displays liberal use of the Complainant’s name: “Jema Africa Ltd” and “Jema Africa”, as well as the logo shown below (with the addition of “LTD” after “JEMA AFRICA”).

The Complainant has Instagram and LinkedIn accounts under the name Jema Africa Limited. The Complainant’s Instagram account has 2,402 followers; its LinkedIn account – 329. The Complainant’s Instagram account features as a profile picture a version of the Complainant’s logo:



The uniforms of its employees and its LinkedIn account feature a similar logo without the orange and black outer concentric rings and the name “JEMA AFRICA LIMITED” on the uniforms and “JEMA AFRICA LTD” on the Complainant’s LinkedIn replacing “JEMA AFRICA”. Trucks and other vehicles used in the Complainant’s business bear “JEMA AFRICA” across the top of the front windscreen. The Complainant claims it has also engaged in exhibiting at international mining exhibitions and trade fairs, attending industry conferences and distributing branded material.

The Complainant’s CEO owns and has licensed to the Complainant the following trademarks registered in Tanzania:

- (1) No. TZ/S/2024/000250 for JEMA TECH (and logo), claiming no exclusive use of the term “tech”, in respect of technological consultancy and computer and technology services in International Class 42, which was filed on February 7, 2024; and
- (2) No. TZ/S/2024/000264 for JEMA AUTO (and logo), claiming no exclusive use of the term “auto”, being disclaimed) in respect of a range retail, advertising and promotional services in International Class 35, which was filed on February 16, 2024.

The representations of the trademarks are:



No. TZ/S/2024/000250



No. TZ/S/2024/000264

In January 2020, a dispute arose between the Complainant and the Respondent involving allegations about misuse of company property.

In February 2020, the Respondent registered the domain name <jemaafrica.com> in his personal capacity.

In April 2020, the Respondent resigned as a director of the Complainant.

In 2022, the Respondent sold his shares in the Complainant. His brother-in-law and co-founder now holds 998 of the 1,000 issued shares.

Between that date and April 2024, the Complaint claims that the Complainant's CEO (and the Respondent's brother-in-law) provided financial assistance to the Respondent on a number of occasions. According to the Complaint, the payments stopped in April 2024. The Complaint includes evidence of unsuccessful requests from the Respondent in June 2024 and August 2025 for payments to assist the Respondent in setting up a printing business in Japan.

On August 17, 2025, the Complainant's CEO discovered the website "www.jemaafrica.com". The website purports to be the Respondent's reflections on 50 years of life and the importance of ethical and transparent leadership. The included headers "Do CEOs in Tanzania – and everywhere – have a responsibility to be ethical and transparent?" and "CEO's in Tanzania – Multiple families (wife & kids) & affairs with staff with no repercussions?" The Respondent also operated a Facebook account under the name "Jema Africa" and an Instagram account with a handle "@jemaafrical.official" which featured images of attractive, scantily clad young women, Facebook posts included text such as "Jema Africa – CEO and staff affairs, hard at work...?..." Both the website and the Facebook account included a comic strip in which "Some Sad Soul Scheming" threatened to sue the Respondent for degrading "my name".

On that discovery, the Complainant's CEO and the Respondent communicated over WhatsApp. There were two rounds of exchanges on August 17, 2025: one between around 05:00 and 05:57 and a second between 09:10 and 09:34. In the first exchange, the Complainant's CEO accused the Respondent of attempting to blackmail him and, after denying it would succeed, stated that the Respondent could keep the domain name, <jemaafrica.com>, and open a business with it. In the second exchange, however, the Complainant's CEO threatened to file a lawsuit "for using his company brand for bad faith."

On September 23, 2025, one of the Complainant's customers contacted the Complainant's CEO drawing attention to the "JEMA Africa" Facebook account stating (in translation) "It is posting things, and personally I think they are not normal."

This led, on September 24, 2025, to further WhatsApp exchanges and telephone calls between the Complainant's CEO and the Respondent.

On September 25, 2025, the Complainant's CEO and the Respondent agreed upon terms to settle their dispute. As set out in Exhibit R-7 to the Response, in return for USD 28,000, the Respondent agreed to transfer to the Complainant ownership of the domain name <jemaafrica.com>, remove all posts and transfer/delete ownership of the related accounts on Facebook, Instagram and WhatsApp and to refrain from creating similar accounts or engaging in similar action in the future. At the Complainant's request, the Respondent issued an invoice in the relevant amount to the Complainant. The Invoice was endorsed with

statements reflecting those conditions and specifically referenced “Jema Africa Ai”.

The transfer of the domain name, <jemafrica.com>, into the Complainant’s name was completed around October 17, 2025.

On November 25, 2025, the Respondent registered the disputed domain names.

On December 7, 2025, the Respondent forwarded to the Complainant’s CEO an email purporting to be from “Erik” the Content Director at J.E.M.A. Ai Africa. Although sent to the Respondent, the email was addressed to “JEMA Africa Co. Ltd. In the email, “Erik” claimed that the project was an AI-generated fictional concept featuring original characters and creative content “unrelated to your organization.”

In subsequent WhatsApp exchanges between the Respondent and the Complainant’s CEO over the period December 21, 2025 to February 9, 2026, the Respondent stated that he was not involved in the “JEMA Africa Ai site” and disclosed that the <jemafrica.net> and <jemafrica.org>.org> disputed domain names had been registered by someone other than the Complainant.

Exhibit R-6 to the Response includes an order summary from the Registrar showing that the disputed domain names were transferred into the Respondent’s name on or about February 10, 2026.

When the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name <jemafrica.net> resolved to a website. The <jemafrica.org> disputed domain name resolved to a “Launching Soon” website. The disputed domain names <jemafrica.pro> and <jemafrica.me> did not resolve to any websites. The landing page of the website at “www.jemafrica.net” is headed “Jema Africa...The Good Word” and features some satirical cartoons. There is also an associated YouTube channel “@JEMAAfricaAI” and Facebook account under the name “JEMA Africa”. The Description of the YouTube channel includes “[...] JEMA Can’t be Silenced J.E.M.A. Ai Africa stands at the frontlines of digital creativity, where African AI-powered storytelling confronts censorship, complacency, and outdated ideas head-on. Our four AI women speak with the clarity and courage too many try to suppress.”

5. Discussion and Findings

5.1 Supplemental Filing

Apart from documents requested by the Panel pursuant to paragraph 12 of the Rules, neither the Policy nor the Rules expressly provide for supplemental filings. Their admissibility is therefore in the discretion of the Panel bearing in mind the requirements under paragraph 10 of the Rules to ensure that the proceeding is conducted with due expedition and both parties are treated equally, with each party being given a fair opportunity to present its case.

Where unsolicited supplemental filings are admitted, it is usually because the material corrects some error or addresses something raised in an opposing parties’ pleading which could not reasonably have been anticipated or which was not otherwise appropriate to deal with until a respondent’s position on a particular point was clear.

The Respondent describes the unsolicited supplemental filing as clarifying aspects of the Response. Given it was filed the day after the Response, and still within the period for the Response, and that the Complainant has not objected to its reception and does not appear to be prejudiced by its acceptance, the Panel admits the Respondent’s supplemental filing.

5.2 Substantive issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of the disputed domain names, the Complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules directs the Panel to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first element that the Complainant must establish for each disputed domain name is that disputed domain name is identical with, or confusingly similar to, the Complainant's trademark.

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 names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Contrary to the Respondent's contention, on the basis of the evidence outlined above the Complainant has proven ownership of rights in JEMA AFRICA, JEMA AFRICA LIMITED, and JEMA AFRICA LTD as unregistered trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. The Complainant has also proven that its CEO owns and has licensed to it registered trademarks for JEMA AUTO (& logo) and JEMA TECH (& logo).

The comparison of the disputed domain names to the Complainant's trademark simply requires a visual and aural comparison of the disputed domain names to the proven trademarks. This test is narrower than and thus different to the question of "likelihood of confusion" under trademark law. Therefore, questions such as the scope of the trademark rights, the geographical location of the respective parties, the date they were acquired and other considerations that may be relevant to an assessment of infringement under trademark law are not relevant at this stage. Such matters, if relevant, may fall for consideration under the other elements of the Policy. See e.g., [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In undertaking that comparison, it is permissible in the present circumstances to disregard the generic Top Level Domain ("gTLD") or country code Top Level Domain ("ccTLD") components as a functional aspect of the Domain Name System. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

It is also usual to disregard the design elements of a trademark under the first element as such elements are generally incapable of representation in a domain name. Where the textual elements have been disclaimed in the registration or cannot fairly be described as an essential or important element of the trademark, however, different considerations may arise. See for example, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10. The figurative elements of the Complainant's trademarks are not so dominating that the verbal element cannot be considered an essential or important part of the trademarks in this case. Accordingly, it is appropriate to apply the usual rule.

Disregarding the ".net", ".org" and ".pro" gTLDs and the ".me" ccTLD, therefore, each of the disputed domain names is identical to the Complainant's unregistered trademark JEMA AFRICA.

Each disputed domain name also consists of the primary distinctive feature of the Complainant's registered trademarks and the term "africa". As this requirement under the Policy is essentially a standing requirement, the addition of this term does not preclude a finding of confusing similarity. See e.g. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Apart from anything else, the primary distinctive feature of the Complainant's registered trademarks remains visually and aurally recognisable within the disputed domain names.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain names are:

- (a) identical with the Complainant's trademark JEMA AFRICA; and
- (b) confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks.

As a result, the requirement under the first limb of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The second requirement the Complainant must prove is that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances can be situations in which the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name:

- (i) before any notice to [the Respondent] of the dispute, [the Respondent's] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) [the Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [the Respondent] has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) [the Respondent] is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

These are illustrative only and are not an exhaustive listing of the situations in which a respondent can show rights or legitimate interests in a domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the Complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. 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.

There is no dispute between the Parties that:

- (1) The Respondent registered the disputed domain names after the Complainant began using the JEMA AFRICA name and also after the Complainant's CEO had registered the trademarks;
- (2) The Respondent is and, when the disputed domain names were registered, was, not affiliated with the Complainant;
- (3) The Complainant's CEO and the Complainant have not otherwise authorised the Respondent to use the disputed domain names;
- (4) The disputed domain names are not derived from the Respondent's name. Nor is there any suggestion of some other name by which the Respondent is commonly known from which the disputed domain names could be derived.

These factors are usually sufficient to establish a prima case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

The Respondent contends that his registration and subsequent sale of the domain name <jemaafrica.com> (which is not at issue in this case, as the parties reached an agreement concerning that domain name last year) was not in bad faith (see Section 5D below). As a result, the history relating to that domain name does not impugn his conduct in registering the disputed domain names. Further, the Respondent contends that the Complainant expressly gave permission to the Respondent to use “Jema Africa”, referring to the WhatsApp exchanges between 05:00 and 05:57 on August 17, 2025. Thirdly, the Respondent contends that there is no evidence of impersonation, claims of affiliation or misleading conduct. The Respondent also contends that there are other unrelated entities legitimately using “jema” across different industries and the Complainant cannot monopolize use of the term “jema africa”.

These arguments do not avail the Respondent in this case. First, the Respondent’s conduct in registering the disputed domain names must be seen in the context of the prior registration of the domain name <jemaafrica.com> and his uncontested history of seeking payments from the Complainant and its CEO. Secondly, the Respondent’s reliance on the permission to use “Jema Africa” apparently granted in the WhatsApp thread on August 17, 2025 must be read in the context of the other exchange on that day between 09:10 and 09:34 and, further, disregards the terms of the transaction agreed on September 25, 2025 in which the Respondent agreed to transfer the domain name to the Complainant, delete the related social media accounts and to refrain from engaging in similar actions in the future.

The fact that there are three other users of “jema” in other industries in other parts of the world does not help the Respondent as he makes no claim deriving from any of them and, in any event, the disputed domain names use the term “jema africa” which is identical to the Complainant’s trademark.

While the Respondent has provided evidence of the disputed domain names being transferred into his name on or about February 10, 2026, the Respondent has provided no information or evidence about the provenance of those disputed domain names, such as who transferred them to him. This information has relevance in the present case as the disputed domain names were registered so quickly after the Respondent transferred the <jemaafrica.com> domain name to the Complainant. Further, the Respondent has provided no information about the curious email from “Erik” or why that person chose to send to the Respondent an email intended for the Complainant. Further still, it will be recalled that the email from “Erik” purported to be as Content Director of “J.E.M.A. Africa Ai”. In his invoice issued in connection with the transfer of the <jemaafrica.com> domain name for USD 28,000, the Respondent stated that he would “Delete and/or transfer any/all Jema Africa Ai related accounts [...]” and “Relinquish and Transfer Jema Africa Ai Intellectual Property Rights” to the Complainant.

Given the Respondent’s history with the Complainant and the scale of its operations across Africa, the Respondent must have realised when registering the disputed domain names that their registration and use had high potential to cause confusion.

In these circumstances and bearing in mind that the Respondent had a lengthy history of seeking money from the Complainant and its CEO and had registered the domain name <jemaafrica.com> and used it to target the Complainant and its trademark, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not been using the disputed domain name <jemaafrica.net> in good faith. Rather, the manner of use of the disputed domain name <jemaafrica.net> appears to be merely a pretext to obtain a further payment from the Complainant.

That finding also precludes the Respondent’s attempt to rely on paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Legitimate noncommercial or fair use must be in good faith.

The position with respect to the other disputed domain names is no better as there has been no use of them and no evidence of demonstrable plans to use them in any particular way.

The Respondent, therefore, has failed to rebut the prima facie case established by the Complainant.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the Complainant has established the second requirement under the Policy also.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third requirement of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain names have been both registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. These are conjunctive requirements; both must be satisfied for a successful complaint: see e.g., *Group One Holdings Pte Ltd v. Steven Hafto*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0183](#).

Paragraph 4(b) identifies situations which may demonstrate that registration or use of a disputed domain name was not in bad faith under the Policy:

For the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii), the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if “found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of [the disputed] domain name in bad faith:

“(i) circumstances indicating that [the Respondent] has registered or [the Respondent has] acquired the [disputed] domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the [disputed] domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [the Respondent’s] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the [disputed] domain name; or

“(ii) [the Respondent has] registered the [disputed] domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [the Respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

“(iii) [the Respondent has] registered the [disputed] domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the Respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the Respondent’s] web site 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 or service on [the Respondent’s] web site or location.

The instances of bad faith set out in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are examples only, intended to illustrate types of conduct which is caught by the Policy. See *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0624](#).

In the circumstances outlined above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established at least the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b)(i) and (ii).

To the extent that the Respondent contends he was not the original registrant of the disputed domain names in November 2025, the relevant time for the assessment of registration in bad faith is the date he became the registrant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.9.

The Respondent seeks to rebut the Complainant’s assertions of bad faith by contending, first, that there is no evidence that the Complainant was under duress or threat. Secondly, the Respondent contends that at no time did he offer to sell either the <jemafrica.com> domain name or any of the disputed domain names to the Complainant. Thirdly, the Respondent contends that there is no evidence of confusion or targeting in the use of the disputed domain names. More broadly, the Respondent contends that this is a commercial dispute outside the scope of the Policy.

The Policy is not precluded, however, because the Parties have a history of commercial dealings. The issue is whether or not the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith in the face of the Complainant’s trademark rights.

The Panel accepts that the Respondent did not initiate the telephone calls leading to the sale of the <jemaafrica.com> domain name and did not expressly offer to sell that domain name or any of the disputed domain names to the Complainant. Those circumstances, however, provide no comfort for the Respondent in the context of this case.

Paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy does not require the Respondent to have initiated negotiations or to have made a direct offer. The issue under this paragraph is whether the Respondent registered *or acquired* the disputed domain names *for the purpose of selling* the disputed domain names to the Complainant (emphasis supplied). The circumstances of this case provide strong circumstantial evidence that was the Respondent's purpose in becoming the registrant of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent has not disputed his history of frequently seeking payments from the Complainant and its CEO. The initial website at "www.jemaafrica.com" and related social media accounts were plainly set up and used to target the Complainant and its CEO. In those circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the CEO contacted the Respondent to try to resolve the issue. Further, in the course of the communications, the Respondent emphasised the costs of his living circumstances and also those already incurred or committed to in connection with his website.

Further still, the time frame between settlement and transfer of the <jemaafrica.com> domain name and the registration of the disputed domain names is very compressed as is the time frame for the Respondent's acquisition having regard to the communications between the Respondent and the Complainant's CEO between November 2025 and February 10, 2026.

As already mentioned, the email (or, it appears, emails) from "Erik" is peculiar and unexplained. It is also peculiar that "Erik" uses the same presentation of "Ai" in the expression "J.E.M.A. / JEMA Africa Ai" as the Respondent used in his invoice issued in connection with the transfer of the <jemaafrica.com> domain name and related matters to the Complainant.

Further, in his subsequent communications with the Complainant's CEO about the disputed domain names, the Respondent pointed out on a number of occasions that the disputed domain names were held by (unknown) third parties and out of the Complainant's control.

Further still, the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names and use of <jemaafrica.net> appears to be in breach of the terms of settlement over the <jemaafrica.com> domain name. Even if it is not a technical breach under Tanzanian contract law (an issue that the Panel need not reach), the registration of the disputed domain names immediately following the transaction related to the domain name <jemaafrica.com> strongly supports an inference of bad faith registration and use for the purpose of selling the disputed domain names to the Complainant.

In these circumstances, the Panel is satisfied that the conditions in paragraph 4(b)(i) have been satisfied.

For these reasons and those outlined in section 5C above, therefore, the Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name <jemaafrica.net> was a mere pretext for the purposes outlined in at least paragraph 4(b)(i) above. Similarly, the registration of the other disputed domain names, which the Panel finds were also used as part of a bad faith effort to sell them to the Complainant, as the trademark owner, for a price in excess of their registration cost, also falls within at least paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established all three requirements under the Policy.

6. 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 names <jemaafrica.me>, <jemaafrica.net>, <jemaafrica.org>, and <jemaafrica.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

Postscript

On May 11, 2026, after the decision had been finalised, the Center received an unsolicited supplemental filing from the Respondent. No explanation has been provided for such a late submission and, in any event, it would not affect the outcome if it were accepted.

/Warwick A. Rothnie/

Warwick A. Rothnie

Presiding Panelist

/David H. Bernstein/

David H. Bernstein

Panelist

/Matthew Kennedy /

Matthew Kennedy

Panelist

Date: May 11, 2026