

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TEDIS v. Mira Holdings
Case No. D2026-2164

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TEDIS, France, represented by CLEACH AVOCATS, France.

The Respondent is Mira Holdings, United States of America ("United States"), self represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tedis.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 19, 2026. On May 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 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 (Domains by Proxy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 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 June 2, 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 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 25, 2026. The Respondent requested 4-day extension per Paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. The Response was due on June 29, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on June 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela, Diane Cabell and Christiane Féral-Schuhl as panelists in this matter on July 17, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a pharmaceutical company created in 1989 in France under the corporate name TEDIS. The Complainant has more than 15 pharmaceutical sites and is established in seven different countries. The Complainant's revenue increased from EUR 33 million in 2011 to approximately EUR 200 million in 2022.

The Complainant is the registered owner of the following trademarks:

- The French trademark TEDIS S.A. (combined) No. 3401390, filed on December 26, 2005, in classes 3, 5, 38, and 41;
- The French trademark TEDIS  (combined) No. 4242718, registered on May 13, 2016, in classes 5, 10, 35, 37, and 41;
- The International trademark  TEDIS  (combined) No. 1314156, registered on May 27, 2016 designating Morocco, Mozambique and OAPI in classes 5, 10, 35, 37, and 41; or
- The Vietnamese trademark TEDIS S.A.  (combined) No. 4-0274941-000 filed on June 5, 2015, in class 5.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain names <tedis.fr> and <tedis.asia> as well as of the mobile application "Tedis Direct", downloadable on Apple and Google platforms, which are used to promote its business and sell its products.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 29, 2016 and it leads to a webpage hosted by GoDaddy, where it is offered for sale. According to evidence with the Complaint, the Whois information includes a reference that "This domain is listed for sale at one of our partner sites for \$95,000".

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 its trademark TEDIS is strongly distinctive as it is a word created by the Complainant, which is not a dictionary word, as it has no meaning in either English or French, nor in any other language. The Complainant submits that its trademarks are fully distinctive and duly exploited in particular in the pharmaceutical and healthcare sectors. The disputed domain name incorporates identically the Complainant's trademark TEDIS, which is enough to establish a likelihood of confusion.

As regards the second element of the Policy, the Complainant argues that it has no relationship whatsoever with the Respondent, and the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use any of its domain names or any of its trademarks in any way and for any reason whatsoever. Furthermore, the disputed domain name was registered more than six years after the registration of the earliest trademark of the Complainant and more than twenty-two years after the creation of the Complainant and the beginning of the use of TEDIS as its corporate name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or a fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, it resolves to a website on which it is offered for sale at auction for USD 95,000.00 and in 2016, right after its registration, it was already for sale for USD 82,500.00 — a price exceeding the out-of-pocket expenses related to registration. Furthermore, according to the Complainant, sophisticated or professional domain name registrants – those who register large portfolios of domain names or operate as domain investors – "cannot credibly claim ignorance of trademark rights that would reasonably have been discovered through basic searches", and in this case the Complainant enjoys an international reputation, and a simple Google search for TEDIS shows the Complainant's official website as the first result, in France but also in the United States, both today and during the period between 1989 and 2016, which predates the registration of the disputed domain name. Therefore, it clearly appears that the Complainant was identifiable through a basic search, either on the Internet or in the WIPO database, and there is no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademarks in mind when acquiring the disputed domain name.

Further, with respect to the third element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that it enjoys an international reputation, as evidenced by the fact that it is indexed and profiled by the world's leading business reference platforms (Dun & Bradstreet, ZoomInfo, Crunchbase, Northdata and Bloomberg), all of which are headquartered in the United States and accessible worldwide, including in the United States. In addition, the Complainant claims that it is known in the United States notably because it assists several laboratories in the promotion, transportation, and distribution of their products, including those of Kenvue and Sanofi, BSV, and Biocodex, which have subsidiaries in the United States, and also the Complainant has always had several clients in the United States. Furthermore, the mere fact that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's distinctive trademark with no addition whatsoever makes it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

As regards the use as described above, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name has never been used in connection with any active website or bona fide offering of goods or services since its registration. It has served exclusively as a vehicle for resale, at an exorbitant price, which suggests that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of selling it to the Complainant or one of its competitors in order to obtain an unfair financial gain. In addition, the Respondent has already been found to have registered in bad faith domain names identical to third-party trademarks, thereby demonstrating a pattern of conduct on its part (*Temco Industrial v. Mira Holdings*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3913](#) - mistakenly cited in the Amended Complaint as WIPO Case No. [D2023-3913](#) and *SRL BOWTEX v. Mira Holdings*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1632](#)).

B. Respondent

The Respondent submits that it is a professional domain name investor with more than 10,000 generic domain names under ownership and offered for sale (details of which are not provided). Further, the Respondent claims that "tedis" is a short, 5-letter, catchy business name used by numerous companies or organizations worldwide. It states that it is also the possessive version of the first name "Tedi", such as "Tedi's Dog Snack", "Tedi's Ice Cream" or "Tedi's BBQ", or a 5-letter abbreviation domain name. The Respondent also provides evidence of other companies using "Tedis" as a commercial name, the most prominent being "Tedi's Dog Snack".

The Respondent contends that it purchased the disputed domain name at auction for a price of USD 2,556, the price paid being based on the quality and memorable nature of the domain. The Respondent also submits a "GO value List" of GoDaddy of more than USD 20,000 and an estimated "Atom.com Domain Appraisal" for more than USD 36,000 for the disputed domain name (both valuations on June 29, 2026).

The Respondent further claims that it has sold comparable domains for considerable sums, such as <hemper.com> for USD 237,000, <binter.com> for USD 160,000, <loxo.com> for USD 93,500, <certik.com> for 77,000 or <arnica.com> for 75,000 (the evidence does not, however, show either the seller or the buyer of any of these domain names). The Respondent also refers to other high-value short domains that are currently owned by it and that have been purchased at auction in a similar manner, such as <finsure.com>, <trigo.com>, <gonet.com>, <scrip.com>, <fonic.com>, <bitel.com> or <altek.com>.

Furthermore, the Respondent submits that a simple search of the USPTO's trademark database for "tedis" returned zero results for the Complainant. The Respondent resides in the United States and is a United States company and it should not be required to check outside of its own country for foreign trademarks. The Complainant has a French trademark but it is non-exclusive and for a narrow class of goods, and because the Respondent has no plan to use the domain name in the pharmaceutical field, the Respondent does not believe that general public sale of a common business domain name infringes the Complainant's trademark. In addition, the Respondent refers to other companies that are using the term "tedis" in their domain names in various TLD extensions, such as <tedis.com.au>, used since 1998 by an Australian company Tedis founded in 1992 to deliver innovative electronic commerce solutions to the Australian industry, <tedis.org> used by a creator of dynamic websites since 2006, <tedis.ua>, used by Tedis Ukraine, a company acting in the business of supply and sale of consumer goods since 2019. Also, the Respondent claims that a search of the WIPO Global Brand database of Trademarks produced a list of 20 live trademarks

for the term “tedis”, out of which eight are owned by groups other than the Respondent, such as “TEDIS”, a Brazilian trademark that was registered in 2025, “TEDIS UKRAINE”, a Ukrainian trademark registered in 2019, or “TEDIS (TELKOM DESIGN SYSTEM)” an Indonesian trademark registered since 2021.

As regards the use, the Respondent claims that the disputed domain name has never been used by the Respondent to interfere in any way with the Complainant’s business, nor to target the Complainant. The disputed domain name is and was parked with an inquiry page (initially at <bodis.com> and currently at <afternic.com>) and it has never been offered for sale directly to the Complainant. Merely directing a common phrase domain name to a “for sale” lander does not constitute targeting of the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant inquired about purchasing the disputed domain name and received a purchase price of USD 95,000 from the broker, which was a starting point in the negotiations, and the Complainant was free to offer a lesser amount to possibly see if a mid-point could have been reached, but it chose to file the Complaint instead, as a plan-B, to get control of the disputed domain name through legal proceedings, which is often bad faith and RDNH is often found by UDRP panels.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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 applicable standard of proof is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”, and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.2.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant’s trademark 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. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” may be disregarded for the purpose of the comparison.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In the light of its conclusions under the third element of the Policy, below, the Panel does not consider it necessary or appropriate to reach a determination under the second element in this case.

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.

A reading of the above provisions of the Policy enables two conclusions. First, the Complainant must establish the conjunctive requirement that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Second, to prove this element, the Complainant could rely on the examples in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. While the Policy provides these circumstances as a non-exhaustive list, it results from the

given examples that these refer to an intentional activity aimed “primarily” at selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant or a competitor for valuable consideration in excess of the costs directly related to the registration of the domain name, “primarily” for disrupting the business of a competitor, “intentionally” attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain, or to prevent the trademark owner to reflect its trademark in a domain name. Further, the examples indicate that the respondent’s registration is directed at the complainant’s trademark rights. Therefore, in order to demonstrate that the Respondent has registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of its trademark at the registration date of the disputed domain name, and that it registered it in order to take advantage of the Complainant’s trademark, to target the Complainant’s rights.

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent’s aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant’s trademark.

First, the Panel does not find that the Respondent was likely to have been aware of the Complainant’s mark based on its alleged reputation. The Complainant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of this Panel that, when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2016, it did so with the Complainant in mind, whether to target it, take unfair advantage of its trademark, or otherwise exploit its reputation. Furthermore, the Panel is not convinced that the Complainant has established that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. In particular, the Complainant neither held nor currently holds any trademark registration in the United States, nor has it demonstrated any actual business presence there. The mere reference on the Complainant’s website to partnerships with companies having a presence in the United States is not sufficient to establish that the Complainant itself enjoyed recognition in that jurisdiction. Furthermore, the Complainant’s international trademark registrations designate only Mozambique, Morocco and the OAPI countries. More generally, the evidence submitted by the Complainant rather suggests that its business activities and trademark protection were essentially concentrated in Africa, together with certain countries in Asia and Europe.

In addition, the Complainant claims it is well known in the United States because it always had several clients in the United States. However, the Panel is not convinced by the evidence adduced by the Complainant in this respect either, which consists of various invoices, out of which only one invoice is dated prior to the registration date of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, where the destination country for the pharmaceuticals was in Africa or Europe, and only the importer was a United States company. The fact that the Complainant might have been known by couple of companies in the United States does not equate in the Panel’s view to the level of public knowledge that could assist in making an inference about the Respondent’s intent at the registration date of the disputed domain name.

Considering the above, the Panel is not able to conclude based on the above evidence that the Complainant had reputation in its trademark and name internationally at the registration of the disputed domain name, and therefore is not able to conclude that the Respondent was, or should have been, aware of the Complainant’s trademarks when it registered the disputed domain name.

Further, the Complainant argues that a simple Google search for the term “tedis” shows the Complainant’s official website as the first result, in France but also in the United States, and both today and during the period between 1989 and 2016, which predates the registration of the disputed domain name — thereby confirming its immediate visibility on the world’s leading search engine, accessible to any Internet user worldwide (Annex 19 to the Amended Complaint). The Panel finds that the only evidence aiming to prove its visibility before the registration of the disputed domain name is a print screen with google searches for the period 1989-January 2016, which indeed shows as the first results the Complainant’s website at <tedis.fr>, but also several other companies and uses of “tedis”, such as “tedis.org”, used by Tedis Design Ltd, a company “for a creation and support of the web sites for wide range of clients. [...]”, or a TEDIS project for International Transport at <cordis.europa.eu>. The Panel does not find that the evidence clearly shows that “tedis” was largely known globally as pertaining to the Complainant at the registration date of the disputed domain name.

What the evidence rather shows is that the Complainant's trademark TEDIS, even if somewhat distinctive, is not unique to the Complainant and the name was used even before the registration of the disputed domain name by other companies in different parts of the world and in different sectors (whether the Respondent would be considered to have targeted any of the other users of TEDIS as trademark, corporate name or in their domain names is not for this Panel to decide).

The Respondent, on the other hand, has provided its reasons for purchasing the disputed domain name and offering it for sale to the general public, and not directed at the Complainant or to its competitors. While the asking price appears high, the Respondent provided an explanation, and the Panel does not find this factor to be persuasive that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of selling it to the Complainant (or a competitor of the Complainant), given also given the amount of time that passed since the registration of the disputed domain name. While the Respondent has not expressly denied in its Response knowledge of the Complainant at the registration date, and some of the arguments for which it had chosen the disputed domain name appear to be carefully created to match its case theory (for example, the Respondent claims to have taken the decision to purchase the disputed domain name based on the considerable price it pretends to have sold comparable domains for, but it does not explain what "comparable" means, and the evidence appears to rather show that such "comparable" sales have been made after the purchase of the disputed domain name; or it claims that there are other companies that use "tedis" in their domain names, but it does not show how many of these were registered in 2016 when it purchased the disputed domain name), the Panel is still mindful that the burden of proof is with the Complainant to prove all three elements of the Policy (paragraph 4(a) last sentence of the Policy), and deems that on the balance of probabilities, the Complainant has not met its burden of proving targeting, therefore bad faith registration on the part of the Respondent.

The Panel notes that the Complainant also invokes that the Respondent has already been found to have registered in bad faith domain names identical to third-party trademarks, thereby demonstrating a pattern of conduct on its part. However, the Complainant does not discuss any of these decisions and explain why they establish a pattern of conduct. In this Panel view it appears that the facts in those cases were different to this one, and in any event, each case should be decided on its own facts. Further, the Complainant does not mention that in a larger number of cases the panels found in favour of the Respondent, and does not distinguish between the two situations.

The Panel is tasked with a limited mandate, to determine, on the balance of probabilities, that the Complainant has established the three elements under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. In this case, on the circumstances discussed above, the Panel is not convinced by the evidence put forward by the Complainant. Nevertheless, the Panel emphasizes that this decision is limited to the scope of the Policy and is made without prejudice to future litigation, the parties remaining free to pursue claims before competent courts, on which the present decision has no precedence.

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

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 Respondent did not expressly ask the Panel to make a finding under paragraph 15(e) of the Rules. However, the Respondent mentioned in passing that "Plan B' is often bad faith and 'Reverse Domain Name Hijacking' or RDNH is often found by UDRP panels". Even in the absence of an express request, the Panel will consider this issue in the circumstances of the case, where if such request was made, it would have been denied.

The Respondent alleges that the Complainant chose to file the Complaint as a plan-B to get control of the disputed domain name through legal proceedings after inquiring about purchasing the disputed domain name and receiving a purchase price of USD 95,000 from the broker. While the disputed domain name was offered for sale publicly for the mentioned amount, there is no evidence of the Complainant having made a direct approach to the Respondent or any attempt to purchase the disputed domain name beyond obtaining an indication of its price via the domain names platform operated by the Registrar. While the Complaint was not convincing, the Panel does not consider that it lacked a plausible legal basis, and it failed mostly on account of the Complainant not meeting its burden of proof on the balance of probabilities on all three elements of the Policy. The Panel does not find sufficient grounds to conclude that the Complainant acted in bad faith or with an improper purpose in bringing the Complaint.

Furthermore, a large number of the Respondent's arguments seemed to this Panel to be fabricated to match a theory of good-faith domain name investor, and in addition, in response to the Complainant's arguments on a pattern of conduct established through two prior UDRP decisions, the Respondent accused the Complainant of an attempt to cast the Respondent in an unfair light and claimed that the decision in the case *SRL BOWTEX v. Mira Holdings, supra* was nullified, while the decision in *Temco Industrial v. Mira Holdings, supra* is pending in federal courts. However, the Respondent did not submit evidence with respect to either of the two cases, while according to public sources, it appears to the Panel that the first case was settled and the second one withdrawn. While this aspect would not have changed the outcome of this case, as each case must be assessed on its own specific facts, it is troubling for the Panel to encounter this type of behavior.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Mihaela Maravela/
Mihaela Maravela
Presiding Panelist

/Diane Cabell/
Diane Cabell
Panelist

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/
Christiane Féral-Schuhl
Panelist
Date: July 31, 2026