

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alex Ikonn, Intelligent Change, LLC v. Jane Watson
Case No. D2026-2355

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Alex Ikonn ("First Complainant") and Intelligent Change, LLC ("Second Complainant"), United States of America, represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Jane Watson, Thailand.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alexikonn.com> is registered with TurnCommerce, Inc. DBA NameBright.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 1, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 3, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Unknown, Redacted for Privacy, NameBrightPrivacy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on June 4, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on June 8, 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 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 9, 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 First Complainant is a lifestyle influencer and entrepreneur. He co-founded and scaled a multi-million-dollar business (Luxy Hair) that he sold in 2018. He is the sole director of the Second Complainant, which has had a registered establishment in the United Kingdom since 2019, and sells the “Five Minute Journal”, among other self-help products. The Second Complainant holds United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00004327675 for ALEX IKONN, registered on April 17, 2026, specifying entertainment and other services in class 41. The First Complainant and the Second Complainant are referred to jointly and separately below as “the Complainant”, except as otherwise indicated.

The Respondent is an individual based in Thailand. According to information presented by the Complainant, a prior UDRP panel found that she had registered and was using another domain name in bad faith. See *Belfius Bank SA / Belfius Bank NV v. Jane Watson*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0298](#).

The disputed domain name in the present case was created on March 10, 2023. At the time when the Complaint was filed, it resolved to a website that prominently displayed a logo enclosing the name “Alex Ikonn” and the title “Growth and Development of Ideas”. The website displayed a list of topics, including business, entrepreneur[ship], marketing, self-help, and lifestyle. It published blogposts, including on the use of an asset trading platform and an investment analysis website. It featured a link to a YouTube video about a young entrepreneur. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website; rather, it is passively held.

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 name is identical to their ALEX IKONN mark. The First Complainant has rights to use that mark to promote both his personal brand and the Intelligent Change brand.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not licensed to use the trademark or the Alex Ikonn name, whether in a domain name, at a website, or otherwise. Further, the Respondent, the disputed domain name and the associated website are not affiliated with the Complainants in any way. The website advertises and offers goods and services competing with those of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered in 2023, at a time when the First Complainant had already become famous and gained significant recognition by the public as an influencer and prominent entrepreneur. The Respondent’s intention to target the Complainant can easily be seen, or at least inferred, by the nature of the disputed domain name and the website to which it resolves.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants’ contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (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 burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainants.

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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of an ALEX IKONN trademark at the time when the Complaint was filed, which is sufficient for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.1.3, and 1.2.1.

The Complainant also claims rights in respect of the First Complainant's personal name "Alex Ikonn". The Policy does not explicitly provide standing for personal names, but the First Complainant claims to hold unregistered or common law trademark rights in ALEX IKONN. In order to establish such rights for the purposes of the Policy, the Complainant must show that this personal name has become a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with the Complainant's goods or services. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.3, and 1.5.2. In view of the Panel's findings above regarding the registered mark, and below regarding bad faith, it is unnecessary to assess the claim of unregistered rights.

The entirety of the ALEX IKONN mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The only additional element is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's ALEX IKONN mark, which creates a high risk of implied affiliation. At the time when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying a logo enclosing the ALEX IKONN mark and content on topics with which the Complainant is associated, particularly entrepreneurship. This may give rise to confusion as to whether the website content was sponsored or endorsed by the Complainant. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not licensed to use the ALEX IKONN trademark in a domain name, on a website, or otherwise. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name is passively held. These circumstances do not indicate that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Further, given that the Respondent's website content promotes an asset trading platform and an investment analysis website, the use of the disputed domain name is for the commercial gain of the Respondent or the operators of the promoted sites, or both. This is not a use of the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Moreover, the Registrar has confirmed that the Respondent's name is Jane Watson, which does not resemble the disputed domain name. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

Based on the record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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. The fourth of these circumstances is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location."

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered in 2023, before the Complainant obtained its trademark registration in 2026. Where a respondent registers a domain name before a complainant's trademark rights accrue, UDRP panels will not normally find bad faith on the part of the respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1. However, in the exceptional circumstances of this case, the Respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain name is likely to have been to capitalize on the Complainant's nascent, as yet unregistered, trademark rights. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2. Since as early as 2014, prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, the First Complainant has appeared on podcasts and social media using his personal name to indicate the source of his entertainment services as a business and lifestyle influencer. His personal name as a whole is distinctive. Not only is the disputed domain name identical to it, but the associated website lists topics associated with the Complainant's entertainment services, such as business, entrepreneur[ship], marketing, self-help, and lifestyle. The Respondent provides no explanation as to why she chose to register the disputed domain name or why the Complainant's mark appears in a logo on her website. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain name was to unfairly capitalize on the Complainant's nascent, as yet unregistered, trademark rights in ALEX IKONN.

As regards use, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's ALEX IKONN mark and formerly resolved to a website displaying a logo enclosing the ALEX IKONN mark, listing and providing content on

topics with which the Complainant's entertainment services are associated. Given the Panel's findings in section 6B above, the Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to her website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of her website or of a product or service on her website within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel takes note that the use of the disputed domain name has changed, and that it no longer resolves to an active website. This change in use does not alter the Panel's conclusion; if anything, it may be a further indication of bad faith.

Therefore, 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 <alexikonn.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: July 17, 2026