

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lizay Kuyumculuk Ticaret Anonim Şirketi v. DNS Administrator, Cykon
Technology Limited
Case No. D2026-1431

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lizay Kuyumculuk Ticaret Anonim Şirketi, Türkiye, represented by YK Hukuk Bürosu, Türkiye.

The Respondent is DNS Administrator, Cykon Technology Limited, Hong Kong, China, internally represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lizay.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 2, 2026. On April 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 8, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 9, 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 15, 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 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 7, 2026. On May 5, 2026, the Respondent requested an extension to file a Response under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. The new due date for Response was May 11, 2026.

The Response was filed with the Center on May 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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 Turkish corporation, engaged in the sale of jewellery, precious metals, and diamonds to consumers.

The Complainant was the registrant of Türkiye trademark registration number 2007 51280 for the combined mark LIZAY ŞEKİL, registered on September 18, 2008 in International Classes 14 and 35. The registration comprised the term LIZAY in stylized letters together with a golden hearts motif. The registration expired on September 22, 2017.

The Complainant is the registrant of various active trademarks for or incorporating the mark LIZAY, including for example:

- Türkiye trademark registration number 2011 94039 for a combined mark LIZAY, registered on November 8, 2012 in International Class 35. The mark comprises the term LIZAY in stylized letters.
- International trademark registration number 1320449 for a figurative trademark LIZAY, registered on February 25, 2016 in International Classes 14 and 35. The mark comprises the term LIZAY in stylized letters. The registration designates a total of 43 countries, including China.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <lizaypirlanta.com>, which was registered on January 19, 2008. It operates a website at “www.lizaypirlanta.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 10, 2008.

The disputed domain name has resolved to a webpage headed with the disputed domain name and stating “Contact us for any business enquiries”, together with a contact form.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that, although the Complainant was incorporated in 2011, its representative individual had done business under the LIZAY trademark since 2000.

The Complainant states that it manufactures products including necklaces, earrings and rings made from precious stones, and that it sells to customers in Türkiye as well as other countries around the world, including for example the United Kingdom, the United States and the United Arab Emirates. It contends that it has gained a reputation among consumers, and exhibits digital and physical publicity materials, advertisements, YouTube content, photographs and media articles. The dates of many of these exhibits are unclear, although two of the media articles are dated 2017 and 2018.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its LIZAY trademarks.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has never licensed or permitted the Respondent to use its LIZAY trademarks, that the Respondent has not been known by the disputed domain name, nor has any corresponding trademark rights, and that the Respondent is not making any active use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that, instead, the Respondent is merely “maliciously occupying” the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. It relies on its registration of the <lizaypiranta.com> domain name in January 2008, and submits (although without further particulars) that the Respondent was aware of both this and its LIZAY trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its LIZAY trademark in a corresponding domain name (paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy).

The Complainant states that, while it approached the Respondent “with the intention of purchasing/acquiring” the disputed domain name, the Respondent responded with an exorbitant price, which constitutes evidence of its bad faith. It exhibits an email from the Respondent dated October 4 (the year is not shown, but appears from the Respondent’s exhibits to be 2024) stating: “The current asking price from the owner is \$1,000,000 USD. Are you interested in proceeding with the purchase?”.

The Complainant requests the Panel to order: “the transfer of <lizay.com> to the Complainant free of charge, or if not, for a fee to be determined by WIPO”.

B. Respondent

The Respondent denies having registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of the Complainant’s LIZAY trademark, and submits that it invented and registered the disputed domain name, along with 35 other, similarly coined, domain names, on December 10, 2008.

The Respondent accepts that the disputed domain name is effectively identical to the Complainant’s LIZAY trademark registrations commencing on November 8, 2012 (see above). It points out, however, that the Complainant’s 2008 trademark was registered as LIZAY ŞEKİL, and that that trademark had ended.

The Respondent submits that the Complainant has historically traded as “Lizay Pirlanta” rather than LIZAY. It contends that the Complainant registered the domain name <lizaypiranta.com> in January 2008 and has subsequently operated its website from that domain name. It states that this trading name is not identical to the LIZAY mark.

The Respondent submits that, while the Complainant must have been aware that the disputed domain name was unavailable to it, it continued nevertheless to registered LIZAY trademarks from 2012 onwards.

The Respondent submits that it was unaware of the Complainant at the date it registered the disputed domain name. It states that the Complainant is principally active in Türkiye, and that even now its operations in other countries, namely Germany and Cyprus, are very limited. It states that it was located over 7,500 kilometers away from the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant has provided no evidence that it was, or should have been, aware of the Complainant at that time.

The Respondent states that it is in the business of investing in non-infringing domain names, which is a legitimate commercial activity. It states that, on December 10, 2008, it registered a total of 36 domain names comprising random combinations of five letters, in the hope that they could at some point be of interest to someone looking for a brand name. It contends that each of these domain names were essentially “gibberish” and that none corresponded to any known brand.

The Respondent produces a series of invoices from Fabulous.com, evidencing the domain name purchases referred to. One such invoice includes <lymur.com> and <keipa.com> in addition to the disputed domain name. Other invoices include, for example, the domain names <apuva.com>, <cepty.com>, <dedoy.com>, <duyal.com>, <sudeh.com> and <tineb.com>.

The Respondent submits that the name “lizay” is not in any event exclusive to the Complainant. It provides evidence of two French trademark registrations, LIZAY RIDER registered in 2016, and LIZAY PARTNERS registered in 2018, held in connection with, respectively, a sports-related business and a management consultancy. It also contends that “lizay” is both a personal name and the name of numerous businesses, as evidenced by Facebook pages for, e.g., Lizay Media, Lizay Fashion, Lizay Creation and Lizay Dress. The Respondent adds that “lizay” is a dictionary word in Haitian Creole, a French-based language, meaning courtesy or politeness.

The Respondent denies that it has engaged in any activities that might suggest it registered the disputed domain name in order to target the Complainant. It states that it has never approached the Complainant with an offer to sell it the disputed domain name (although it was approached by the Complainant, as discussed below) and has never used the disputed domain name for any purpose connected with the Complainant’s business activities. It adds that it is fanciful to suggest that it registered a total of 36 similar domain names, all on the same day, merely as a pretext for targeting the Complainant’s trademark.

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has failed to disclose the full facts of negotiations between the Parties concerning the disputed domain name. The Respondent provides evidence that the Complainant first approached it on September 24, 2024, without revealing its identity, requesting an asking price. The Respondent requested an offer, to which the Complainant replied with an offer of USD 1,500, which the Respondent rejected, without immediately making any counter-proposal. While the email evidence is incomplete, the Respondent appears on October 4, 2024 to have quoted a price of USD 1 million, which the Complainant stated was too much. On October 9, 2024, the Respondent rejected a “best offer” from the Complainant of USD 50,000.

The Respondent submits evidence that it received a further, again unattributed, enquiry from the Complainant on April 3, 2026, which was followed shortly by a UDRP dispute notification from the Registrar (the Panel notes that the Complaint was in fact filed on April 2, 2026).

The Respondent requests the denial of the Complainant, together with a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking against the Complainant. Its basis for this claim is that the Complainant is legally represented, and should have been aware that the Complainant could not succeed, given that it had no identical trademark at the date the disputed domain name was registered, and has produced no evidence that the Respondent targeted its trademark. It submits that the Complainant has had full knowledge of the disputed domain name registration for many years, but has continued to register LIZAY trademarks, and should also have been aware of multiple other users of that name. The Respondent contends that the only purpose of this proceeding is to attempt in bad faith to obtain the disputed domain name, following two unsuccessful efforts by the Complainant to purchase it, which the Complainant did not candidly disclose.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is 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 name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark LIZAY, albeit that all of its registrations appear to comprise or include a figurative element. The disputed domain name is identical to textual component of the trademark, and the first element under the Policy is therefore satisfied. It is irrelevant for the purposes of the first element (although potentially material to the second and/or third elements) that the Complainant's sole registration at the date the disputed domain name was apparently for LIZAY ŞEKİL, or that that trademark had expired prior to the issue of the Complaint.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

For the reasons which are discussed in detail in connection with the third element under the Policy, below, the Panel finds that the Respondent conceived of the disputed domain name independently of the Complainant's trademark rights, and registered and has maintained it as part of a portfolio of speculatively registered, fanciful, domain names intended for possible resale.

As recognized in section 2.1 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"): "[...] generally speaking, panels have accepted that aggregating and holding domain names (usually for resale) consisting e.g., of acronyms, dictionary words, common phrases, or unique/catchy or memorable terms (alone or in combination) can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the UDRP where the respondent can show that the purpose of the registration was not to target a trademark".

The Panel finds the above circumstances to be applicable in this case, and does not therefore find the second element under the Policy to have been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name was both registered, and has been used, in bad faith. To demonstrate registration in bad faith, the Complainant must show that the Respondent was (or should have been) aware of its trademark at the time it registered the disputed domain name, and did so with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent was indeed aware of its LIZAY trademark when it registered the disputed domain name in December 2008, relying upon its (then active) Turkish trademark registration dated September 2008, and its own domain name at <lizaypirlanta.com>, dating from dated January 2008. The Respondent contends, by contrast, that it was not, and had no reason to be aware, of the Complainant's trademark, and that it independently conceived of the disputed domain name as a speculative domain name investment.

The Panel finds, on balance, that the Respondent's explanation for its registration of the disputed domain name is plausible, and that the Complainant has failed to establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain name was registered in order to target its trademark. The Panel reaches this conclusion for a number of reasons.

First, while the Complainant's LIZAY trademark is somewhat distinctive in nature, the Panel does not find that name to be referable exclusively to the Complainant. The Panel notes the French trademark registrations exhibited by the Respondent (albeit registered after the date of the Complainant's earliest trademark), its use as a personal and business name by other third parties, and its Haitian dictionary meaning.

The Panel also finds the Complainant's evidence of the reputation and profile of its LIZAY mark as at December 2008 to be weak. While it refers to its website at "www.lizaypirlanta.com", it does not provide any evidence of the content of that website at the time, and a review of "www.archive.org" does not conclusively demonstrate any active website content until May 2010.¹ Further, while producing some evidence of its more recent commercial profile, the Complainant does not provide evidence of its reputation in December 2008 or, e.g., evidence that an Internet search at that time would have produced any results relating to it. The Panel finds no basis to conclude, therefore that the (Hong Kong, China, based) Respondent was likely to have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Panel finds the Respondent's explanation for its registration of the disputed domain name to be credible. While it is certainly coincidental that a term coined by the Respondent is the same as a trademark registered by the Complainant some two months previously, the Panel is persuaded by the Respondent's evidence of its registration of a total of another 35 similarly constructed, coined, five-letter, domain names on the same date it registered the disputed domain name. This evidence supports the impression of the Respondent building a legitimate, speculative, domain name portfolio, as opposed to targeting the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Panel also notes the absence of any indicia that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in December 2008 either to mislead Internet users, or with the objective of selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant for an inflated sum. The Panel accepts finds that the Respondent has never used the disputed domain name for, e.g. pay-per-click links to goods or services competitive with the Complainant's, or in any other active manner which could cause confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

Nor at any time did the Respondent initiate any contact with the Complainant regarding a possible sale of the disputed domain name: it was indeed the Complainant that contacted the Respondent in this regard, some 16 years after the disputed domain name was registered. While the Respondent's stated price of USD 1 million was certainly aggressive, and sought no doubt to take maximum financial advantage of the Complainant's interest, that price demand in 2024 does not support an inference that the disputed domain name was registered in 2008 with the Complainant or its trademark in mind.

The Panel also notes the Complainant's delay of 18 years in bringing this proceeding or, apparently, in voicing any challenge to the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. While panels under the UDRP do not recognize any defence of laches or acquiescence, it is generally accepted by panels that a complainant who delays for many years in bringing a complaint is liable to face considerable evidential difficulties in establishing registration of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Noting finally that the disputed domain name has only resolved to a "contact" page, which could be deemed a "passive" holding of the disputed domain name, the Panel has regard to the criteria set out in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#), for the assessment of bad faith in such cases.² While recognizing that the disputed domain name is somewhat distinctive in character, the Panel has found nevertheless that legitimate use of the disputed domain name, in the circumstances advanced by the Respondent, is conceivable.

For all the above reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has failed to establish the third element under the Policy.

¹ As discussed in section 4.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision.

² See also section 3.3 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

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 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 reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16. The Panel finds there to be a number of reasons why a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking might be warranted in this case. These matters include the Complainant's inability to show that the Respondent was, or should have been, aware of its LIZAY ŞEKİL trademark at the date the disputed domain name was registered, its failure to have challenged the disputed domain name for a period of 18 years while continuing to register other LIZAY marks, and its unattributed approaches to the Respondent seeking to purchase the disputed domain name, issuing this proceeding only when unsuccessful.

Against these factors, however, the Panel takes account of the fact that the Complainant's LIZAY trademark is an invented and somewhat distinctive term, that the disputed domain name was registered less than two months after the Complainant's LIZAY ŞEKİL trademark registration, that no active use was made of the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent demanded a price of USD 1 million for the disputed domain name, albeit in response to the Complainant's approach. In these circumstances, while the Complaint was ultimately unsuccessful, the Panel does not find that the Complainant (and its representatives) would, at the outset, necessarily have viewed the Complaint as without merit or without any reasonable prospect of success.

In the circumstances, the Panel declines to make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026