ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tradeview Markets Spa, Tradeview Europe Limited, Tradeview Financial Markets S.A.C. v. Domain Manage, Domain Manage Dot Com Ltd
Case No. D2026-2141

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Tradeview Markets Spa, Tradeview Europe Limited, and Tradeview Financial Markets S.A.C., Chile, represented by Diaz Donoso & Cia, Chile.

The Respondent is Domain Manage, Domain Manage Dot Com Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by Bernstein IP, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tradeview.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 May 18, 2026. On May 19, 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 (Unidentified Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on May 22, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on May 25, 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 June 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 21, 2026. On June 8, 2026, the Respondent requested automatic four calendar day extension for Response, and the due date for Response was extended to June 25, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on June 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero, Felipe Claro, and Nick J. Gardner as panelists in this matter on August 14, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 Complainants Tradeview Markets Spa ("the first Complainant"), Tradeview Europe Limited ("the second Complainant"), and Tradeview Financial Markets S.A.C. ("the third Complainant"), belong to the Tradeview group of companies, which provides trading technology services under the marks TRADEVIEW and TRADEVIEW MARKETS, offering solutions for electronic access to the forex and equity markets.

The second Complainant is licensed as a "Class 2 Investment Service Company" regulated by the Malta Financial Services Authority (MFSA), enabling to provide financial services across various asset classes and operate under the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID) II framework. The third Complainant is regulated by the Securities and Commodities authority (SCA) in the United Arab Emirates.

The second and third Complainants are the owners of several trademark registrations for TRADEVIEW and TRADEVIEW MARKETS, including the following:

- Chile trademark registration Nos. 1471687 for TRADEVIEW (word mark), filed on December 20, 2024, and published on March 14, 2025, in class 9; 1468753 for TRADEVIEW (word mark), filed on December 20, 2024, and registered on July 11, 2025, in class 42; 1468677 for TRADEVIEW (word mark), filed on December 20, 2024, and registered on July 11, 2025, in class 35; 1468686 for TRADEVIEW (word mark), filed on January 7, 2025, and registered on July 11, 2025, in class 38. All these trademarks are registered in the name of the third Complainant;

- Chile trademark registration Nos. 1468671 for TRADEVIEW MARKETS (figurative mark), filed on December 20, 2024, and registered on July 11, 2025, in class 42; 1468687 for TRADEVIEW MARKETS (figurative mark), filed on January 7, 2025 and registered on July 11, 2025, in class 38; 1468672 for TRADEVIEW MARKETS (figurative mark), filed on December 20, 2024, and registered on July 11, 2025, in class 36; 1468678 for TRADEVIEW MARKETS (figurative mark), filed on December 20, 2024, and registered on July 11, 2025, in class 9. All these trademarks are registered in the name of the third Complainant;

- European Union trademark registration No. 018718568 for TRADEVIEW MARKETS (figurative mark), filed on June 17, 2022, and registered on September 30, 2022, in classes 36 and 42, registered in the name of the second Complainant.

The third Complainant also owns trademark registrations for TRADEVIEW MARKETS FUTURES, STOCKS & OPTIONS VM (figurative mark), including Mexico trademark registration Nos. 2025757, filed on April 2, 2019, and registered on August 2, 2019, in class 36; and 2025756, filed on April 2, 2019, and registered on August 2, 2019, in class 42; Brazil trademark registration No. 916954978, filed on March 20, 2019, and registered on December 24, 2019, in class 36; Colombia trademark registration No. 711547, filed on March 26, 2019, and registered on May 5, 2020, in class 36; Peru trademark registration Nos. S00103015, filed on July 21, 2017, and registered on October 2, 2017, in class 36; and S00102732, filed on filed on July 21, 2017, and registered on September 22, 2017, in class 42.

The Complainants operate their website at the domain name <tvmarkets.com>, registered on April 4, 2004. On their website, the Complainants offer order routing services for financial and futures markets, through applications and software that also facilitates the monitoring of such assets. In addition, the Complainants offer courses and online tools for participation in the financial markets.

The Respondent is a private limited company which was incorporated under the laws of the United Kingdom on January 17, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 31, 2003. According to the Response, the disputed domain name was acquired by the Respondent on June 10, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering decentralized currency trading services under the name “TradeView”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain names are identical to their registered trademark TRADEVIEW.

The Complainants claim that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because:

- the Complainants have not authorized the Respondent to use their trademarks;

- considering the Complainants’ trademark TRADEVIEW is well-known and widely recognized, having a strong presence in the trading market, it is unlikely that the Respondent used the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainants’ trademark and is used to offer the same type of services offered by the Complainants, without having knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark;

- since the Respondent’s website is only partially operational, and its associated social media accounts were created in March 2026, the Respondent is attempting to take unfair advantage of the Complainants’ reputation to exploit consumer confusion and defraud customers;

- since websites are not limited by territorial borders, the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent amounts to an infringement of the Complainants’ registered trademark TRADEVIEW since the website is accessible to users from countries where the Complainants’ trademark is registered.

The Complainants submit that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith in order to attempt to attract, for commercial gain, users to its website, by creating confusion with the Complainants. The Complainants point out that the Respondent started using the disputed domain name to offer services identical to the ones of the Complainants after the registration of the Complainants’ trademarks, and states that the Respondent’s use of the Complainants’ well-known and widely recognized trademark to identify the same services is not a mere coincidence.

The Complainants further contend that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name has the effect of disrupting the Complainants’ business, not only due to the confusion resulting from the use of the disputed domain name to offer services identical to the ones of the Complainants, but also because such use undermines the organic Search Engine Optimization (SEO) developed by the Complainants to appear among the top results on the Google search engine, as the website interferes with search engine results and is recommended in place of the Complainants’ website.

Lastly, the Complainants state that their trademark TRADEVIEW is a validated by sector-specific regulatory frameworks in multiple jurisdictions, which require the Complainants to proactively deter any conduct that could constitute fraud or phishing. In this context, the Complainants claim that the current use of the disputed domain name risks to cause reputational harm to the Complainants and potentially jeopardize their licenses and registrations as a regulated entity.

B. Respondent

The Respondent does not dispute the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainants' trademark TRADEVIEW but contends that the Complainants have not satisfied the second and third elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent states that its company was founded in the United Kingdom on January 17, 2024, and has been duly listed in the United Kingdom Companies House register for over two years, well before the Complaint was filed by the Complainants. The Respondent submits that it operates a bona fide business consisting of domain name acquisition, sales, loans, and brokerage services, as well as building websites and offering website design, development, SEO, advisory, digital asset management, and technical support services for others.

The Respondent asserts that it purchased the disputed domain name for substantial sums on June 10, 2025, for purposes of developing a decentralized exchange trading platform for active traders in the blockchain industry and claims that the Respondent chose to register the disputed domain name for its descriptive value to match its offerings since it consists of two common English words, i.e. "trade", which means the "business of buying and selling or bartering commodities" and "view", which means the "act of seeing or examining".

The Respondent rebuts the Complainants' contention that it has used the disputed domain name for fraudulent purposes and state that it has used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of services, consisting in the offering of crypto-related financial services, and that it started doing so before receiving notice of the dispute.

The Respondent asserts that its website offers a decentralized crypto platform for traders to invest in, and trade cryptocurrency as well as social features and mobile access where users can follow public trader leaderboards, trading quests, and badges. The Respondent further states that its website also offers the Respondent's "TVX" crypto token as well as white-label services for token projects, institutions, decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs), and fintech startups who wish to launch their own decentralized trading platforms.

As to the Complainants' allegations on the Respondent's bad faith, the Complainants contend that it did not register the disputed domain name in bad faith as it was not aware of the Complainants' trademarks until it received copy of the Complaint. The Respondent also claims that it did not intend to use the disputed domain name to sell, disrupt, or trade on the Complainants' trademarks.

The Respondent points out that the Complainants have failed to demonstrate that the Complainants' trademarks are uniquely associated with the Complainants and that the Respondent targeted the Complainants at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent further states that the Complainants do not have trademark rights in the United Kingdom, where the Respondent is based, and that the Complainants have not demonstrated beyond conclusory allegations that their trademarks are well-known in such country.

The Respondent submits and demonstrates through Annexes 12 through 23 to the Response that many third parties use the term "tradeview" (and variations thereof) in their domain names and subdomains on a concurrent and non-exclusive basis worldwide, and that many of them use domain names encompassing "tradeview" to offer finance and/or are financial trading exchanges and platforms and, in some instances, cryptocurrency trading exchanges and platforms.

Lastly, the Respondent requests that the Panel find that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the UDRP process since: i) the Complaint consists of "only the barest of allegations without any supporting evidence"; ii) the Complainants knew that it had no trademark rights in the United Kingdom but brought the Complaint in the hope that the Respondent would not respond to the Complaint;

and iii) the Complainants' ultimate goal in this administrative proceeding was to secure the disputed domain name for a lower price than it would have paid the original registrant of the disputed domain name.

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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1. Indeed, the Complainants have provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for TRADEVIEW in numerous jurisdictions.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name without any variation. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

As to the generic Top Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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 that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent used the disputed domain name, and the name "TradeView" encompassed in the disputed domain name, in connection with a bona fide offering of services. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.2.

The Respondent has submitted copy of articles published on informational websites dedicated to cryptocurrency services as well as on the popular financial and business news website "Business Insider" referencing to the Respondent's "TradeView" platform and the related cryptocurrency trading services and predating the filing of the Complaint.

The Panel notes that, under the circumstances, the Respondent appears to have registered the disputed domain name in view of its combination of the combined English words "trade" and "view", which are descriptive or suggestive of the Respondent's business. Moreover, the Respondent has demonstrated that such terms are concurrently used by several third parties, including many operators in the financial trading sector.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the Complainants have failed to demonstrate that the Respondent intended to target its trademarks through use of the disputed domain name. Indeed, contrary to the Complainants' allegations, the Panel does not find that the disputed domain name is being used to impersonate the Complainants as the layout, content, colors and overall appearance of the Respondent's website is different from the one of the Complainants.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the evidence in the case file does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainants' trademark.

As indicated above, although the disputed domain name was originally registered in 2003, the Respondent submitted to have acquired it only on June 10, 2025. The Panel has no reason to doubt the truth of this allegation, which appears to be corroborated by the screenshots and articles on records. The date on which the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name is the date a panel will consider in assessing bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.9.

The Complainants provided evidence of ownership of trademark registrations for or encompassing TRADEVIEW which predate the acquisition of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, even though none of such trademarks were registered in the United Kingdom, where the Respondent is based.

The Complainant also demonstrated that it used its trademarks TRADEVIEW and TRADEVIEW MARKETS in connection with its financial trading services prior to the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, but, in the Panel's views, has not proven that its TRADEVIEW mark is well-known also in the Respondent's country and, above all, that "Tradeview" is a name that users identify exclusively as the Complainants' trademark. Indeed, as indicated in section 6.B above, there are several concurrent uses of the term "Tradeview" by third parties even in the financial trading sector in which the Complainants operate.

In view of the above and since the Respondent appears to have used the disputed domain name to promote its independent business without intending to capitalize on the Complainants' trademarks, the Panel finds that the Complainants have failed to demonstrate that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 is not persuaded that the circumstances of this case justify a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

The Panel notes that the Complainants filed the Complaint against the disputed domain name without addressing the bad faith registration element, but, according to the Respondent's submissions, the disputed domain name was acquired by the Respondent only on June 10, 2025.

The Complainants have registrations for the TRADEVIEW mark (albeit not in the Respondent's country) which predate the acquisition of the disputed domain name by the Respondent and the mark is identically reproduced in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the disputed domain name has been redirected to a website offering services similar to the ones provided by the Complainants under the TRADEVIEW mark in the financial sector and the Panel also noted the Complainants' asserted concerns as to the use of the disputed domain name for fraudulent activities given the field in which they operate. However, as detailed above, the Panel is of the view that, based on the records, the Respondent, on balance of probabilities, registered and used the disputed domain name to promote its independent business and not to defraud users passing off as the Complainants.

Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that this is a denial case but does not deem appropriate to make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

The request for a Reverse Domain Name Hijacking is also denied.

/Luca Barbero/
Luca Barbero
Presiding Panelist

/Felipe Claro/
Felipe Claro
Panelist

/Nick J. Gardner /
Nick J. Gardner
Panelist
Date: August 28, 2026