

ADMINISTRATIVE Panel DECISION

EOS Worldwide, LLC v. Eric Grill, Chainbytes LLC

Case No. D2026-2125

1. The Parties

Complainant is EOS Worldwide, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by McCoy Russell LLP, United States.

Respondent is Eric Grill, Chainbytes LLC, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <eosmeetings.com> (hereinafter “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 15, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 19, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 19, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 20, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on June 25, 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

Since 2006 Complainant has used the trademark EOS (hereinafter the “Mark”), which is an acronym for Entrepreneurial Operating System, in connection with business development and consulting services and related software tools, which it promotes at its website under its domain name <eosworldwide.com>.

Complainant owns United States trademark registrations for the Mark, including:

- No. 7,565,607 (registered November 12, 2024)
- No. 3,432,932 (registered May 20, 2008)

Complainant’s website explains that the EOS system, software and services help entrepreneurs set goals and priorities, conduct meetings, and track progress using a variety of tools that Complainant names “V/TO” (“Vision Traction Organizer”), “Scorecard” (accountability tracker), and “Rocks” (highest priority tasks to be completed within 90 days) during quarterly sessions. Complainant also owns United States Registration No. 7,495,688 (registered September 3, 2024) for the trademark LEVEL 10 MEETING, which Complainant uses in connection with services and software that help clients manage meetings consistent with the EOS system.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered January 10, 2026. It resolved to a website that promotes an AI product that was “built for teams running on EOS” and offers a “complete EOS Toolkit” including “Scorecards,” “Rocks,” and “Accountability Chart,” all of which, as noted above, are terms that Complainant uses on its website to describe features of its system. The website under the Disputed Domain Name encourages visitors to “Run your business on EOS with AI. The next generation platform for teams running on EOS. AI-powered meeting facilitation...” The website invites visitors to use Respondent’s program to “run your LEVEL 10 MEETINGS.”

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that Respondent’s website mimics elements of Complainant’s website and falsely implies an affiliation with Complainant and that Complainant has not authorized Respondent to claim that its AI tools are compatible with and enhance the performance of Complainant’s EOS system and software.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

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 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.

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 Mark is reproduced and 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here "meetings," may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this 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.

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 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 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 respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 Disputed Domain Name implies an affiliation with Complainant. "Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), 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. Rather than negate any perception of affiliation, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name – "Mark + the term meetings" - communicates that the associated website will include information about meetings conducted in with branded meeting tools authorized and approved by Complainant. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name belongs on the impersonation end of the "broad continuum of factors that are useful in assessing possible implied sponsorship or endorsement."

In the content of the associated website Respondent does not include any statement disavowing sponsorship or approval by Complainant or otherwise make it "clear to Internet users visiting the respondent's website that it is not operated by the complainant." [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.2. On the

contrary, by using other terms and trademarks that Complainant uses on its website, the content of Respondent's website exacerbates the mistaken perception of affiliation. In particular, Respondent uses Complainant's registered trademark when it invites visitors to use Respondent's program to "run your LEVEL 10 MEETINGS" and thereby falsely implies that Respondent's product, which purports to use AI to enhance meetings conducted using Complainant's LEVEL 10 MEETINGS tool, is compatible with and authorized by Complainant.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Respondent was aware of and targeted Complainant and its Mark when he registered the Disputed Domain Name. Unquestionably, Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with Complainant's Mark in mind for the purpose of attracting for commercial gain Internet users who were familiar with Complainant and its Mark. Respondent promotes its product as "built for teams running on EOS" the "platform for teams running on EOS" and that provides a "Complete EOS Toolkit."

The Panel also finds that Respondent intentionally used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith to attract Internet users for commercial gain by causing confusion with Complainant's Mark and falsely communicating an affiliation with Complainant for commercial gain. The Panel finds that this is bad faith use under the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: July 9, 2026