

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Trigyn Technologies v. Lucas Berggreen
Case No. D2026-1849

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Trigyn Technologies, India, represented by Soteria LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”).

The Respondent is Lucas Berggreen, Norway.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <trigyn.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 29, 2026. On April 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 4, 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 amended Complaints on May 4, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 May 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 26, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 information technology company that provides services such as data engineering, data management, data visualization and AI development services.

The Complainant owns Indian Trade Mark Registration No. 2663961 for TRIGYN TECHNOLOGIES that was registered on January 22, 2014.

The Complainant has a website located at the domain name <trigyn.com>.

The Respondent did not file a Response, so little information is known about the Respondent. According to the Registrar's records, the Respondent has an address in Norway.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 24, 2026.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active 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.

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions.

The registered trademark is a non-dictionary, unique term.

There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent does not own the trademark rights to "Trigyn Technologies".

The website at the disputed domain name cannot be reached, indicating further evidence the Respondent has not established or proven a legitimate unique, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is visually identical to the Complainant's official domain name. This strongly suggests the Respondent is aware of the Complainant and their brand elements, and it is highly unlikely that the registration of the disputed domain name was coincidental and should be considered as evidence of bad faith registration according to the Policy.

The disputed domain name poses a significant security threat to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (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.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

The Complainant's trademark registration includes the term TECHNOLOGIES which is a general term that describes the Complainant's industry. The dominant term of the Complainant's trademark, which the Complainant uses for its own domain name is TRIGYN.

The disputed domain name is for "trlgyn" which is a misspelling of TRIGYN. The "t" in TRIGYN is replaced by an "l" in the disputed domain name.

"A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark." See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Complainant has long-standing trademark rights, and the Complainant's TRIGYN TECHNOLOGIES trademark is somewhat unique.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant's domain name and the dominant term of the Complainant's trademark. The "i" in TRIGYN is replaced by an "l" in the disputed domain name. These letters appear similar.

This suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant. The Respondent did not file a Response to rebut such contention.

Under the second and third elements of the Policy, "panels will normally find that employing a misspelling in this way signals an intention on the part of the respondent (typically corroborated by infringing website content) to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant". See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Here, there is no evidence that the disputed domain name has been used.

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. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the 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 <trlgyn.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: June 22, 2026