

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rep Data, Inc. v. Priya Goyal, rerdata.com

Case No. D2026-2011

1. The Parties

Complainant is Rep Data, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Jones Walker LLP, United States.

Respondent is Priya Goyal, rerdata.com, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rerdata.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 8, 2026. On May 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to Complainant on May 15, 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 May 22, 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 May 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 11, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on June 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on June 24, 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.

On July 21, 2026, the Panel issued the following Procedural Order No. 1:

“The Panel notes that Respondent contact details as provided to the Center by the Registrar lists ‘Priya Goyal, rerdata.com’ as Respondent, with a contact address in the state of Florida, United States of America. Pursuant to its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the ‘Rules’), and section 4.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([‘WIPO Overview 3.1’](#)), the Panel notes that an Internet search of Respondent’s name and location returns results for an individual named ‘Priya Goyal’ involved with a real estate company named ‘Royal Empire Realty, LLC’, which operates a website at the domain name <rerdata.us>, with a contact address that matches Respondent’s purported address.

In light of this, Complainant is invited to provide comment on the Panel’s findings by July 28, 2026. Respondent will then have until August 4, 2026, to comment on Complainant’s reply to the procedural order.”

Neither Party replied to Procedural Order No. 1.

4. Factual Background

Complainant asserts:

“The Complainant is the owner of the registered United States trademark REPDATA, U.S. Reg. No. 7992818, registered on October 21, 2025, in connection with “market research services.” [...] Rep Data has continuously used the REPDATA mark in commerce since at least April 2020.”

A copy of the foregoing trademark registration certificate is annexed to the Complaint.

Complainant’s commercial website is accessible via the Domain Name <repdata.com>. At this website, Complainant lists several prominent businesses that use its services, including the National Football League, Netflix, Clorox, Michigan State University, and Google.

The Domain Name was registered on February 21, 2026. The Domain Name resolves to a website indicating that the site is under construction.

Respondent has not participated in this proceeding, despite the Panel’s Procedural Order No. 1. It appears that Respondent is involved in a real estate business.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. With respect to the bad faith element, Complainant argues in part:

“The Respondent has not made any active or legitimate use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the domain name currently resolves only to an “under construction” page. Under established UDRP precedent, the passive holding of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith where the totality of the circumstances indicates that the domain name was registered to target the complainant’s trademark. See WIPO Overview 3.[1], [section] 3.3.”

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the 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 Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel concludes the Complainant has rights in the trademark REPDATA through registration demonstrated in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to that mark. The Domain Name replaces the "p" with an "r". In the Panel's view, the mark remains recognizable within the Domain Name despite this minor change.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Respondent has not come forward in this proceeding to explain herself or articulate its reason for registering the Domain Name. Absent any contrary input from Respondent, and given the close similarity between Complainant's mark and the Domain Name, and given the fact that Complainant's customer base suggests that the REPDATA mark enjoys a degree of renown, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent's purpose here was somehow to refer to Complainant.

This conclusion is buttressed by the fact that the Domain Name, while containing the initials "rer" (potentially connected to Respondent's real estate business), also contains the word "data," which does not in the Panel's view have any immediately obvious connection to the choice of a name for a real estate business. Respondent has not offered any explanation why the word "data" appears in the Domain Name.

It bears repeating here that Respondent has had multiple opportunities to explain why it registered the Domain Name – by responding to the Complaint or by responding to the Procedural Order No. 1 – and chose not to do so; the Panel also notes that the Respondent was on copy on several pre- and post-complaint notification communications from the Center but did not react whatsoever to any of those. At some point

negative inferences (notwithstanding the <rerrdata.us> domain name that Respondent apparently owns) become warranted. This is, in the Panel's view, such a case.

The Panel concludes that Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation," are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in "bad faith":

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel concludes, under the Policy and the record presented here, that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the "Rights or Legitimate Interests" section.

The Panel further notes, as Complainant asserts, that in certain circumstances the mere passive holding of a Domain Name is not inconsistent with a finding of bad faith registration and use of a domain name. The Panel concludes that the circumstances apparent in this record support such a finding here.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 Domain Name <rerrdata.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: August 11, 2026