ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TZAFON INC. v. Patrik Alfvegren, TeenVoice International Limited
Case No. D2026-1401

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TZAFON INC., United States of America, represented by Fross Zelnick Lehrman & Zissu, PC, United States of America.

The Respondent is Patrik Alfvegren, TeenVoice International Limited, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tzafonai.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 April 1, 2026. On April 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 14, 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 (Sophos Evolution LTD) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 16, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar.

The Complainant requested the suspension of the proceeding on April 20, 2026, and the proceeding was suspended on April 21, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Complainant requested the reinstitution of the proceeding and filed the Amended complaint along. The proceeding was reinstituted on May 4, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 proceeding commenced on May 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 24, 2026. The Respondent filed a Response on May 22, 2026.

On May 26, 2026, the Complainant filed a Supplemental Filing. The Respondent replied to said Supplemental Filing on June 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on June 5, 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 artificial intelligence ("AI") software developer founded in 2024, specialized in developing software and products that enable AI to take independent, meaningful action within digital environments.

The Complainant uses the TZAFON mark as the brand of its company. The term "tzafon" means "north" in Hebrew and has no meaning in the AI field.

The Complainant owns the International trademark registration No. 1895218 for TZAFON (word mark), registered on August 20, 2025, with a priority date of July 8, 2025, in classes 9 and 42, designating European Union, United Kingdom, Sweden, Republic of Korea, and Israel. At the time of the Decision, Statements of grant of protection have been issued with regard to European Union, Sweden, and United Kingdom.

The Complainant is the owner of the United States trademark application No. 99271983 for TZAFON (word mark), filed on July 8, 2025, in International Classes 9 and 42, which was used as basic application for the International trademark registration No. 1895218 cited above.

The Complainant owns and operates its main website at <tzafon.ai>, registered on September 2, 2024.

The disputed domain name <tzafonai.com> was registered on August 7, 2025, and currently resolves to an error page. According to the screenshots submitted by the Complainant – which have not been contested by the Respondent – prior to this proceeding the disputed domain name resolved, initially, to a landing page, and subsequently to a website providing news and information about the AI industry under the headline "Tzafon AI News", featuring an article about the Complainant and additional articles about unrelated AI companies and projects. The "About" section of the website also included the following wording: "Tzafon AI News™ scans AI related news and reports what is most relevant for its readers. Tzafon AI News™ is a trademark that is used by Sophos Evolution Ltd, […] London". The Respondent's website has been promoted through three social media accounts created on or about August 7, 2025, all identified with the username "Tzafonai".

On September 9, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent, to which the Respondent replied on September 12, 2025.

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 submits that the disputed domain name <tzafonai.com> is confusingly similar to the trademark TZAFON in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the term "ai", followed by the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com".

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because: i) the Respondent does not own trademark rights in the TZAFON mark; ii) since the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its TZAFON mark and the Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent, any use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent violates the Complainant's common law rights that the Complainant has acquired in the TZAFON mark; iii) the Complainant filed its Complainant's trademark application in the United States weeks before the Respondent started to name its AI news website "Tzafon Ai News" and displayed content related to the Complainant's trademark and business; iv) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name just days after the Complainant filed its trademark application for TZAFON in the United States; v) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name as the Respondent can point to no independent use of the TZAFON mark that might predate the Complainant's use of the mark; vi) the Respondent opted to name its AI news website at the disputed domain name "Tzafon AI News" and displayed content at the top of its website that referred explicitly to the Complainant's trademark and business; vii) the Respondent's business consists of repackaging AI-generative news from the Complainant and others and then claiming those marks as its own, like in the case of the disputed domain name, which has been used to hijack consumers looking for the Complainant and to pass off the Respondent's website as one emanating from the Complainant.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant contends that, considering the Complainant had used the TZAFON mark for months, received press coverage regarding use of the mark and had also applied to register the TZAFON mark prior to registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was plainly aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also states that any use of the disputed domain name would cause confusion with the Complainant and submits that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name amounts to bad faith according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy as the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

The Complainant submits that, in response to its cease-and-desist letter, the Respondent claimed to have independently adopted the TZAFON mark based on the Hebrew meaning of the term, without providing explanations as to the reason why it opted for such unusual term for an AI news service. In this regard, the Complainant contends that there is no reason to believe the Respondent registered the disputed domain name independently without intending to trade off and benefit from the Complainant's reputation and the goodwill the Complainant had developed in the TZAFON trademark, especially considering the timing of the registration, which occurred few months after the Complainant began use of the TZAFON mark in the United States and few weeks after the Complainant applied to register its mark in the United States.

The Complainant informs the Panel that, after receipt of the cease-and-desist letter, the Respondent offered to modify its mark from “Tzafon Ai News” to “Tzafonai News” and notes that this would not have been a material modification. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent added disclaimers to its website and social media accounts, but they were in a font smaller than most other text and therefore not sufficient to the scope of avoiding confusion.

The Complainant also submits that Respondent registered two additional domain names incorporating the name of third-party AI companies in combination with the “-ai” suffix and used them in connection with “AI news” aggregation websites almost identical to the website to which the disputed domain name resolved.

Lastly, the Complainant also informs the Panel that, after receiving notice of this dispute, the Respondent contacted the Complainant’s counsel and, during the suspension of the proceeding, the Respondent requested an amount of 4,500 EUR to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The Complainant states the Respondent’s request is a clear attempt to profit from the registration of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent denies having registered or used the disputed domain name in bad faith and with the intent to impersonate the Complainant, mislead users, or exploit the Complainant’s goodwill in bad faith.

The Respondent contends that the website connected to the disputed domain name “formed part of a broader AI-related informational and commentary initiative focused on developments within the rapidly growing AI sector”. The Respondent further explains that “The project also explored AI-related branding and online identity concepts connected with emerging trends and companies in the AI field”.

The Respondent submits that it did not intend to deceive users into believing that its website was operated by or officially connected with the Complainant and that it did not use its website for phishing, fraud, malware, impersonation of customer services, collection of credentials, or sale of competing products or services and that no products or services were sold through its website.

Lastly, the Respondent acknowledges that the Complainant objected to the disputed domain name and asserts that, following the settlement discussions with the Complainant, its website and related project are no longer being actively developed and the related activity has ceased.

The Respondent thus leaves the matter to the Panel for determination and confirms that it has no intention to continue any dispute with the Complainant.

C. Complainant’s Supplemental Filing

In its Supplemental filing of May 26, 2026, the Complainant offers rebuttal to the arguments raised in the Response and notes that, while the Respondent claimed that its website had been deactivated and any related activity had ceased, the Respondent’s website was, instead, still active.

The Complainant also states that, in light of the Respondent’s claim that it had “no intention to continue any dispute with the Complainant” and considering the Respondent does no longer appear to seek payment of 4,500 EUR in exchange for the disputed domain name, which had been its prior position, the Panel could order the transfer of the disputed domain name based on the Respondent’s consent to transfer.

D. Respondent’s Supplemental Filing

In its Supplemental Filing of June 1, 2026, the Respondent provides clarification on its statement that its website and related project were no longer being actively developed and that related activity had ceased, indicating that it intended to refer to the cessation of active development, publication and project activity. The Respondent states that no new content has been published on its website since December 2025, and the date displayed on the website homepage was automatically generated by the website software and does not indicate that new content was being published or that the project remained under active development.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary procedural issues

6.1.1. Supplemental Filings

Both Parties in this case submitted unsolicited Supplemental Filings.

No provision concerning supplemental filings are made in the Rules or Supplemental Rules, except at the request of the panel according to paragraph 12 of the Rules, which states the panel, in its sole discretion, may request any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case.

According to paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel has the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, ensuring that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

As stated in the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged - unless specifically requested by the panel - and the party submitting an unsolicited supplemental filing should clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response.

Accordingly, UDRP panels generally accept supplemental filings only when they provide material new evidence or a fair opportunity to respond to arguments that could not reasonably have been anticipated.

In the case at hand, the Panel notes that part of the Complainant's Supplemental Filing offers rebuttal to the Respondent's arguments concerning the justification provided by the Respondent for its selection and use of the disputed domain name and the allegations submitted by the Respondent to substantiate a legitimate interest. The Panel notes that, also in view of the prior correspondence exchanged between the Parties prior to this proceeding, these arguments raised by the Respondent were not unforeseeable and, therefore, the Panel does not deem appropriate to admit such part of the Complainant's Supplemental submission.

However, the Panel has deemed it appropriate to admit another part of the Supplemental Filing – as reflected under Section 5.C above – to the extent that the Complainant provides comments on i) the Respondent's claimed cease of its activity under the disputed domain name, noting that the disputed domain name was still redirected to an active website, and ii) the Respondent's lack of intention to continue any dispute with the Complainant, from which the Complainant infers the Respondent's consent to transfer, since both statements submitted in the Response could not have been anticipated by the Complainant.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent replied to the Complainant's Supplemental Filing providing clarifications as to its asserted cease of activity through the website at the disputed domain name, specifying that it intended to refer to the cease of the website development.

Under the circumstances, the Panel has decided to take both Supplemental Filings into consideration and does not deem necessary to request further supplemental submissions to the parties.

6.1.2. Respondent's consent to transfer

The Panel notes that, in its Response, the Respondent states that its website and the related project are no longer being actively developed and the related activity has ceased after receiving notice of the dispute. The Respondent clarifies in its Supplemental Filing that it ceased to develop its website, even though the website itself has not been deactivated. The Respondent also states that it "leaves the matter to the Panel for determination and confirms that there is no intention to continue any dispute with the Complainant".

In its Supplemental Filing, the Complainant submits that the Respondent's statements imply a consent to transfer and states that "this tacit consent to transfer the Domain Name to Complainant permits the Panel to proceed immediately to make an order for transfer".

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has ceased to use the disputed domain name for an active website at the time of this Decision, as it resolves to an error page, and such circumstance could suggest the Respondent's actual intent to relinquish to the disputed domain name to avoid continue the dispute with the Complainant. However, the Panel also notes that the Respondent expressly stated that it left the matter to the Panel for determination and did not expressly consent to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. Moreover, the Respondent denied any intent to impersonate the Complainant, mislead Internet users, or exploit the Complainant's goodwill in bad faith.

Under the circumstances, the Panel finds it appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a 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." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

(i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) that the disputed domain name has been 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 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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of valid trademark registrations for TZAFON in European Union, United Kingdom, and Sweden.

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 the two-letter term "ai" (which can be interpreted as an acronym of "artificial intelligence"), 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.

As to the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing but did 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.

According to the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark or the disputed domain name.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name. Indeed, the registrant's name indicated in the registration records does not correspond to the wording encompassed in the disputed domain name and the Respondent has not demonstrated to be genuinely commonly known by the name "Tzafonai" apart from the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.3.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that, even though the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website, based on the evidence provided by the Complainant – which has not been contested by the Respondent, the disputed domain name resolved prior to this proceeding to a website featuring the trademark TZAFON, also in the headline "Tzafon AI News" and providing purported news and articles about the AI industry, including an article about the Complainant. The website also included the statement "Tzafon AI News™ is a trademark that is used by Sophos Evolution Ltd".

The Panel also notes that the Respondent stated that its website was part of a "broader AI-related informational and commentary initiative focused on developments within the rapidly growing AI sector", but did not provide explanations about the reason of its selection of the disputed domain name, encompassing the Complainant's prior trademark in its entirety. The Respondent's explicit reference to the Complainant, its trademark and products on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark and intended to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion and association with the Complainant. The Panel also finds that the Respondent's subsequent publication of a disclaimer in small characters on its website, as highlighted by the Complainant, was not sufficient to prevent the risk of confusion, but rather suggests the Respondent understood that Internet users may be confused.

Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name did not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark.

In addition to the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is inherently misleading, as it reproduces the TZAFON mark in its entirety in association with the acronym AI, which is descriptive of the Complainant's services. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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.

The Panel notes that, based on the records, the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent after the Complainant had received significant press coverage across technology, venture capital, and AI-focused news websites. Moreover, the disputed domain name was registered few weeks after the filing of the Complainant's trademark application for TZAFON in the United States. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its TZAFON mark at the time of registration. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

Moreover, considering the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the Complainant's trademark TZAFON with the descriptive term "ai", and the explicit reference to the Complainant and its trademark on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, the Panel finds that the Respondent was actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademark.

The Panel also finds that, in view of the initial redirection of the disputed domain name to the website described above, providing news and information related to the Complainant as well as to other entities operating in the AI sector, without sufficiently disclaiming the lack of affiliation with the Complainant, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the TZAFON mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to an error page. 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. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name and its prior use made by the Respondent, and finds that, under the circumstances, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent's request for an amount of 4,500 EUR to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant after receiving notice of the dispute, in the context of the above, further demonstrates that the Respondent intended to derive profits from the registration and use of the disputed domain name and acted in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <tzafonai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/
Luca Barbero
Sole Panelist
Date: June 19, 2026