

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hamilton Paul Bielkiewicz v. Mark R Hamilton
Case No. D2026-1293

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hamilton Paul Bielkiewicz, United States of America (“United States”), self-represented.

The Respondent is Mark R Hamilton, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hamiltonpaul.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 25, 2026. On March 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 27, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 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 April 10, 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 April 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 5, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 an individual residing in the State of New York, United States. The Complainant is an actor, singer, and concert pianist with a website at “www.hamiltonpaulofficial.com”. The Panel notes that this domain name was created on February 15, 2023.¹

The Complainant holds United States Trademark Registration Number 8184528 for the word mark HAMILTON PAUL, registered on March 24, 2026, in international class 41 for organization of exhibitions of musical entertainment. The Complainant claims to have used the mark in commerce since at least June 29, 2024, in connection with professional musical and entertainment services.

The disputed domain name was created on July 29, 2021, and is registered to the Respondent Mark R Hamilton, an individual listing a postal address in the State of California, United States. The contact email address given in the registration is [xxx]@paramountpropertyco.com. The domain name used for that email address is not associated with an active website, but the Panel notes that the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine shows that it formerly resolved to the website of Paramount Property Company, a property management company based in the San Francisco, California area and serving the San Francisco, Seattle, and Denver metropolitan areas. The Panel also notes that the online database of the California Secretary of State shows that a Paramount Property Company, Ltd. is registered as a California stock corporation (number 3723072), with a principal address in San Francisco, and the Bizapedia listing for that company identifies it as a property management company of which “Mark Hamilton” is the chief executive officer.

At the time of submitting the Complaint and rendering this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a landing page “parked free, courtesy of GoDaddy.com”. The landing page features a “Get This Domain” button, an article on “How to Play Roblox Online” and pay-per-click (“PPC”) links to third-party advertisers relating to Roblox and related topic. More “comprehensive” searches on other subjects are available from the footer of the landing page, leading to other third-party advertisers.

The Complainant reports that he made multiple attempts to acquire the disputed domain name through a domain broker an “direct outreach”, with no response.

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 his registered HAMILTON PAUL trademark and that the Respondent has no permission to use the mark. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent’s last name is “Hamilton” but his name is not “Hamilton Paul”. Moreover, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is not making a bona fide commercial offering using the disputed domain name, as the disputed domain name is only parked, which also constitutes bad faith because “the Respondent has continued to hold the domain name after being placed on clear notice of the Complainant’s rights”.

¹ Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the recently registered HAMILTON PAUL word mark) for the purposes of the Policy, and this suffices to establish standing under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. However, this is immaterial given the Panel's finding on the third Policy element.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Given the Panel's finding on the third Policy element, it is not necessary to assess the Respondent's possible rights or legitimate interests, and the Respondent did not appear in this proceeding to proffer any such rights or interests.

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 (emphasis added) of a domain name in bad faith. However, these are predicated on a reasonable inference of bad faith intent to attack the Complainant's mark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, as well as in subsequent use.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant himself states that he began using HAMILTON PAUL (his first and middle names) as a mark in commerce "since at least June 29, 2024" and offers no evidence of earlier use in the Complaint or in his application for trademark registration. The disputed domain name was registered nearly three years earlier, on July 29, 2021. This timing normally precludes the possibility that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, in an attempt to exploit the Complainant's mark, unless the Respondent demonstrably had reason to anticipate the subsequent trademark registration ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.8.1, 3.8.2), or unless the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name more recently. However, the Complainant has offered no evidence to indicate the likelihood of either of these possibilities, and the Panel finds none in the available record. There is no apparent connection between the New York entertainer and the San Francisco property manager, nor is there evidence of substantial publicity using the Complainant's stage name in 2021.

It is not clear why the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, but the Panel does note that he shares half of the composition of the same with his own personal family name (namely, "Hamilton"), suggesting that there may be a logical link between the two.

The Panel finds on this record that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name in bad faith targeting of the Complainant or its trademark rights because the Complainant had no trademark rights at the time that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1. The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (“RDNH”) or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute RDNH. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

The Complainant’s bad faith argument is based solely on the Respondent’s maintaining the disputed domain name after receiving notice of the Complainant’s very recent trademark registration, ignoring the fact that the disputed domain name was registered three years before the Complainant even began using the mark. The Panel normally would be inclined to find RDNH for pursuing a complaint with such glaring defects. However, the Panel does not choose to ascribe bad faith to an individual complainant who is not represented by legal counsel absent other indicia of unjust dealing or abuse of the administrative proceeding.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: May 22, 2026