ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Invesco Ltd v. Antonio Pistilli, roi
Case No. D2026-2381

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Invesco Ltd, United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Antonio Pistilli, roi, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <invesco-plc.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 2, 2026. On June 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 2, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 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 5, 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 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on July 10, 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 Complainant is an independent investment management firm founded in the United States in 1935. Since its establishment, the Complainant has developed into a globally recognized financial services provider, serving clients in more than 120 countries through 20 regional offices across North America, Europe, the Middle East, and the Asia-Pacific regions, and employing approximately 7,500 professionals worldwide. The Complainant's corporate group comprises many subsidiary entities, including Invesco Finance PLC, incorporated in the United Kingdom.

The Complainant's subsidiary Invesco Holding Company Limited is the owner of numerous trademark registrations incorporating the mark INVESCO, including, inter alia:

- United States trademark registration INVESCO (word), No. 1825441, registered on March 8, 1994, in class 36;

- European Union trademark registration INVESCO (word), No. 000030072, registered on October 14, 1999, in class 36; and

- United Kingdom trademark registration INVESCO (word), No. 00002255203, registered on March 28, 2003, in class 36.

The Complainant maintains a significant Internet presence and owns numerous domain names, including its primary domain name <invesco.com> registered in 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 10, 2025. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name used did not resolve to any active site. The Complainant has filed evidence showing that it previously resolved to a page with pay-per-click ("PPC") links to third-party websites related to financial services, including "Stock Market Investment", "Share Market Investment", and "Stock Investment". As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

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:

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, since it incorporates the INVESCO mark in its entirety, and the addition of hyphen and the term "plc" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The term "plc" is a common United Kingdom business abbreviation for "public limited company", therefore it increases the confusing similarity. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has no license or authorization to use the INVESCO mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring links to third-party websites competing with Complainant's business. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed

domain name. The current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent.

3. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered on June 10, 2025. Registering the disputed domain name so obviously connected to a well-known mark without authorization is itself evidence of bad faith. The Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a parked webpage containing PPC links to third-party websites relating to financial and investment services. Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's INVESCO trademark in its entirety together with the term "plc", reinforces the conclusion that the Respondent targeted the Complainant. Therefore, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial purposes, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's INVESCO trademark. The Respondent used a privacy service to conceal its identity and provided apparently inconsistent registration details. In particular, the listed address combines different United Kingdom cities, which further supports a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer the disputed domain name. In UDRP cases, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, the Complainant has to demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

(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 Respondent was given proper notice of the Complaint and had the opportunity to respond. Under paragraph 5(a) of the Rules, the Respondent was required to submit its response within 20 days of commencement of the proceeding. The Respondent failed to do so.

Pursuant to paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the event of such a default, the Panel shall proceed to a decision based on the Complaint. However, the Respondent's default does not mean that the Complainant automatically prevails; the Complainant continues to bear the burden of proof on each element. The Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's silence, and, where appropriate, accept as true the reasonable allegations in the Complaint that are not contradicted by evidence.

The Panel has reviewed the entire case file and the evidence provided. The Panel is also guided, where pertinent, by the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), which reflects consensus positions of UDRP panels on many common issues. The Panel will make reference to these consensus views in the analysis below as applicable.

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 mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its INVESCO mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's INVESCO mark in its entirety, with the only differences being the addition of the term "plc" and hyphen. In accordance with WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8, addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the gTLD ".com" is required only for technical reasons and is generally disregarded for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's mark to the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 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 record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not filed a Response and therefore has not rebutted the Complainant's case or provided any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests under the Policy or otherwise.

The evidence shows that as of the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to any active website and previously resolved to a parked webpage with PPC links to third-party competing sites. Such use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy in the circumstances of this case. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9. Nor does the Respondent's conduct qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has established trademark rights in INVESCO trademark and has confirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademarks. There is also no evidence that the

Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Because the Respondent has chosen not to participate in these proceedings, it has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant is a United States-based investment management firm and a globally recognized provider of financial services. The Complainant operates under and is known by the INVESCO name, which it uses in connection with its investment management activities and related financial services.

The disputed domain name incorporates the INVESCO mark in its entirety, merely adding the non-distinctive term "plc", hyphen and the gTLD ".com". The Panel notes that one of the Complainant's subsidiary entities in the United Kingdom is "Invesco Finance PLC". Therefore, noting also the similarity of the disputed domain name and the Complainant's own domain name <invesco.com>, in the Panel's view the Respondent's inclusion of the term "plc" in the disputed domain name, on the balance of probabilities, suggests that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant.

The disputed domain name previously was inactive and later resolved to a parked webpage reproducing the Complainant's INVESCO mark, displaying PPC links to third-party websites related to financial and investment services (competing with the Complainant's offering). This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Although the website has since been deactivated, this does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

The Respondent has not provided any explanation for selecting the disputed domain name and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its mark. The absence of any Response further reinforces the inference of bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent used a privacy service in connection with the registration of the disputed domain name and provided apparently false or inconsistent registration details, including an address combining different United Kingdom cities. While the use of a privacy service is not in itself indicative of bad faith, in the circumstances of this case, taken together with the inaccurate registration details and the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name to display PPC links targeting the Complainant's field of activity, these circumstances constitute additional factors supporting the Panel's finding of bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6.

Considering the totality of the circumstances, including the Complainant's established trademark rights, the Respondent's reproduction of the Complainant's INVESCO mark, the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name for PPC links relating to financial services, and the clear absence of any rights or legitimate interests, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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 <invesco-plc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/
Ganna Prokhorova
Sole Panelist
Date: July 22, 2026