

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Incident Catering Services, LLC v. Bambang Hansen
Case No. D2026-1656

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Incident Catering Services, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Bambang Hansen, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ellipse-global.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 17, 2026. On April 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 20, 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 21, 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 22, 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on May 20, 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 has, since 2016, provided catastrophe management solutions and emergency incident response services to support and facilitate disaster mitigation, including wildfires, hurricanes, and earthquakes.

The Complainant owns United States Trademark Registration No. 5845887 E ELLIPSE GLOBAL (device) in classes 35, 41, 43, and 45, having a registration date of August 27, 2019, and a use in commerce date of July 21, 2016.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 21, 2016, and presently resolves to a website entitled “KUDAPOKER”, offering gambling services to users in Indonesia. The Complainant’s evidence establishes: a) that the Complainant previously owned the disputed domain name and used it for its primary website until inadvertently allowing it to lapse; and b) after the disputed domain name lapsed, as at April 14, 2026, it resolved to a replica of the Complainant’s website, as well as a poker website.

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 was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to impersonate the Complainant for the Respondent’s commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[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.

The entirety of the verbal element “ELLIPSE GLOBAL” of the Complainant’s mark E ELLIPSE GLOBAL 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. To the extent that the Complainant’s registered mark includes stylized or figurative elements, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10. The addition of a hyphen between the components of the Complainant’s mark

within the disputed domain name does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity. See *VeriSign Inc. v. Bin g Glu / G Design*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0421](#).

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 not rebutted the 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel 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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant’s mark for the Respondent’s commercial gain, falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant claims to have previously owned the disputed domain name but inadvertently allowed it to lapse. The Panel’s independent¹ viewing of publicly available Whois history, Internet Archive, and domain name sales records for the disputed domain name support this claim. The Internet Archive shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website relating to the Complainant’s business from at least as early as 2017 until at least as late as April 2025. Additionally, as set out in the Factual Background section above, the Complainant’s evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a replica of the Complainant’s website in April 2026. Changes to the disputed domain name’s name servers and hosting IP addresses suggest that a change in control of the disputed domain name occurred circa July 2025. Domain name sales records indicate that the disputed domain name was purchased at an auction of expired domain names held by the Registrar in June 2025.

¹ In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

In the circumstances, and without any evidence from the Respondent to the contrary, it appears likely that the Respondent purchased the disputed domain name at auction in June 2025 upon its expiry, before which the disputed domain name was controlled by the Complainant. The Panel thus considers June 2025 the relevant date for assessing bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.9.

The Panel notes that original creation date of the disputed domain name has not changed since its original registration, but the Panel is aware that it is the practice of some registrars to retain the original registration date where a domain name is acquired through an expired domain name auction or sale, which appears to have occurred here. Additionally, the Complainant claims that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name on or about April 6, 2026. It appears to base this claim upon the “Updated Date” in the Whois record for the disputed domain name alone. This is, however, contradicted by the direct evidence showing that the disputed domain name was sold at the Registrar’s auction in June 2025 addressed above. The Panel’s viewing of the Whois history records for the disputed domain name also revealed that the changes to the Whois records indicated by the “Updated Date” relied upon by the Complainant were in fact irrelevant changes to the disputed domain name’s status. In the circumstances, these inconsistencies do not change the Panel’s findings as set out above.

By June 2025, the Complainant’s mark had been in use for around nine years and registered for around six years. By choosing to configure the disputed domain name to resolve to a website replicating the Complainant’s website after it acquired the disputed domain name, the Respondent deliberately sought to impersonate the Complainant. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary from the Respondent, it appears likely that this was intended to be for the Respondent’s commercial gain, which is indicated by the disputed domain name’s use for gambling and poker services. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation, as in this case, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

In the circumstances of this case, the Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent’s failure to take part in the present proceeding where an explanation is certainly called for. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <ellipse-global.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: May 27, 2026