

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tealium Inc. v. Pravin. Bedekar
Case No. D2026-1379

1. The Parties

Complainant is Tealium Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fafinski Mark & Johnson, United States.

Respondent is Pravin. Bedekar, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tealiummail.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 31, 2026. On April 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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 / Privacy User #8755c5e1, See PrivacyGuardian.org (The RDAP server replaced the value stored in the database with a different value)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 2, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 3, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 28, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on April 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on May 4, 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

Complainant, Tealium Inc., is a United States based company with headquarters in San Diego, California that offers and sells a customer data platform and related solutions to assist companies to, inter alia, unify and manage their data. Complainant uses the mark TEALIUM in connection with its services and owns a number of trademark registrations for its TEALIUM mark. These include, inter alia, registrations in the United States (Nos. 4380057 and 4380058, that both issued to registration on August 6, 2013) and the European Union (No. 011943636, that issued to registration on November 20, 2013). Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <tealium.com> for a website concerning Complainant and its services and for email purposes.

Respondent appears to be based in the United States. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on December 12, 2025. It does not appear that Respondent has ever used the disputed domain name for an active website or page.

In late December 2025, Complainant contacted the Registrar concerning the disputed domain name and received a response from such on December 31, 2025 which declined to take any action in the matter.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active webpage.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that it owns rights in the TEALIUM mark, a term Complainant maintains it coined, by virtue of its many trademark registrations for TEALIUM around the world.

Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is essentially identical and confusingly similar to the TEALIUM mark as it fully incorporates the TEALIUM mark in its entirety. Complainant further asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as (i) TEALIUM is an invented term by Complainant for which Complainant has obtained 24 trademark registrations, (ii) Respondent owns no rights in the TEALIUM name or mark, and (iii) Complainant has not licensed or authorized Respondent to use the TEALIUM mark. Lastly, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith given the "suspicious timing of the domain name's registration, lack of plausible circumstances in which Respondent could legitimately use the domain name, and the fact that 'Tealium' is intimately connected with Complainant's business." In that regard, Complainant notes that it detected suspicious activity related to Complainant's network on December 12, 2025 shortly after the disputed domain name was registered.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) 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

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”) at section 1.7. Complainant has provided evidence that it owns trademark registrations for the TEALIUM mark and that such issued to registration well before Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

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 Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name.

Here, the disputed domain name fully incorporates the TEALIUM mark. Although the addition of the common word “mail” at the tail of the disputed domain name may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such element does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the TEALIUM mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel thus finds that 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 a 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 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 that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name that is clearly based on the TEALIUM mark does not seem coincidental, particularly as a simple Internet search would have quickly revealed Complainant's rights in and use of the TEALIUM mark. To be sure, the disputed domain name on its face is likely to mistakenly be seen by consumers as connected to Complainant, particularly as the use of the word "mail" after the TEALIUM mark suggests that the disputed domain name is related to communications from Complainant. This is telling in view of Respondent's failure to appear in this matter to present any evidence justifying its registration of the disputed domain.

Additionally, it should be noted that Complainant asserts that it apparently detected suspicious activity on its network shortly after the disputed domain name was registered. Complainant does not provide any details concerning this activity so the Panel cannot ascertain whether such in fact occurred. However, the fact that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has not appeared in this matter, does raise a question as to whether the disputed domain name, which clearly invokes Complainant, was registered for some potential nefarious activity.

In all, to the Panel there is little doubt that Respondent has registered the disputed domain name for Respondent's unfair profit or benefit and possibly for a malicious activity.

The Panel thus 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 view of Respondent's actions, and failure to appear in this proceeding, it seems more likely than not that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name has been done opportunistically and in bad faith for Respondent's benefit or profit. Respondent's bad faith is underscored by Respondent's registration of a domain name that consumers will more than likely associate with Complainant. That Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for an active website or page does not detract from such a finding. To be sure, the apparent likelihood that TEALIUM mark is a coined term (as Complainant claims) coupled with the fact that a simple Internet search would have quickly revealed Complainant's rights in TEALIUM make it more likely than not that Respondent was well aware of Complainant's rights in the TEALIUM mark when it registered the disputed domain name.

In all, the evidence before the Panel, along with Respondent's failure to appear in this proceeding, makes it more probable that Respondent has acted in bad faith for the benefit of Respondent.

The Panel thus finds that 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 <tealiummail.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahitchevansky/

Georges Nahitchevansky

Sole Panelist

Date: May 18, 2026