

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

NVIDIA Corporation v. Triumph Team, Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2403

1. The Parties

The Complainant is NVIDIA Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Triumph Team, Nigeria, and Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <nvidiacorp.com>, and <nvidiarecruits.com> (collectively, the “Disputed Domain Names”) are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 3, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On June 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 5, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file a separate complaint for the disputed domain name associated with a different

¹ One of the Respondents appears to have used the name of an unrelated individual when registering the disputed domain name <nvidiarecruits.com>. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted that Respondent's name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Disputed Domain Names, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

underlying registrant or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 2, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Weston as the sole panelist in this matter on July 13, 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 a NASDAQ listed multinational technology company founded in 1993 that operates a business which develops graphics processing units (GPUs), systems on chips (SoCs), and application programming interfaces (APIs) for a broad range of applications. The Complainant employs over 42,000 people across more than 50 offices and made revenue of USD 215.9 billion in financial year 2026. It holds a portfolio of registrations for its trademark, and variations of it, in numerous countries. Examples include United States Trademark Registration No. 1895559 for the word mark NVIDIA, registered on May 23, 1995, in class 9; European Union Trademark Registration No. 000749382 for the word mark NVIDIA registered on October 14, 1999 in classes 9, 35, and 42; United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. UK00900749382 for the word mark NVIDIA registered on October 14, 1999 in classes 9, 35, and 42; Canada Trademark Registration No. TMA531920 for the word mark NVIDIA, registered on August 29, 2000 in class 9; and United States Trademark Registration No. 2386115 for the mark NVIDIA (logo), registered on September 12, 2000 in class 42.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names that comprise or contain the trademark NVIDIA including the domain name <nvidia.com> with 34 million visits in April 2026 alone.

The Disputed Domain Name <nvidiacorp.com> was registered on March 30, 2026.

The Disputed Domain Name <nvidiarecruits.com> was registered on March 4, 2026

The Disputed Domain Names do not resolve to active websites. Mail Exchange (“MX”) records in connection to the Disputed Domain Name have been activated, and the Complainant has provided evidence that both Disputed Domain Names were used in furtherance of a recruitment scam scheme.

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 Names.

Notably, the Complainant cites its trademark registrations for the mark NVIDIA and variations of it, in numerous jurisdictions, as prima facie evidence of ownership.

The Complainant contends that its rights in the mark NVIDIA predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Names. It submits that the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to its trademark, because each is comprised of the NVIDIA trademark along with terms such as "corp" and "recruits" under the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", and that these variables are not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names because "the Respondent does not have any trademark rights to the term NVIDIA or any other term used in the Disputed Domain Names. There is also no evidence that the Respondent retains unregistered trademark rights to the term NVIDIA or any other term used in the Disputed Domain Names. Furthermore, the Respondent has not received a license from the Complainant to use a domain name featuring the NVIDIA mark" and that none of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy apply. The Complainant also contends that the Respondents' use of the Disputed Domain Names "to send phishing emails impersonating the NVIDIA brand" means "the Respondent should not be deemed to have used the Disputed Domain Names in a bona fide manner."

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names were, and currently are, in bad faith, contrary to the Policy and the Rules having regard to the prior use and "globally known" nature of the Complainant's trademark. On the issue of registration, the Complainant contends that "[t]here would be no plausible bona fide use of the Disputed Domain Names by a party other than the Complainant, given the renown and distinctiveness of the NVIDIA brand" and that it has been targeted by the Respondents.

On the issue of use the Complainant contends that "the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Names to send emails that impersonate the Complainant, including use of the NVIDIA logo which is a registered trademark owned by the Complainant". It contends that "such behaviour is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith."

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the Disputed Domain Names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following:

- the Disputed Domain Names were registered within a one-month period in March 2026 with the same Registrar;
- the Disputed Domain Names share a similar pattern using the Complainant's NVIDIA trademark followed by terms such as "corp" and "recruits";
- the Disputed Domain Names share a similar pattern, each using address in Nigeria and a "gmail" account based email address;
- the Disputed Domain Names utilize the same MX servers;
- the Disputed Domain Names were used in the same manner: to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant to advance a recruitment-related scam.

The evidence submitted points to the fact that the Disputed Domain Names are subject of common control by the Respondents. The Respondents had the opportunity but did not respond to the Complaint.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

- (i) that the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and
- (iii) that the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 Names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. The requirements of the first element for purposes of the Policy may be satisfied by a trademark registered in any jurisdiction. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Complainant has produced sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has registered trademark rights in the mark NVIDIA in a number of jurisdictions.

Turning to whether the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the NVIDIA trademark, the Panel observes that:

- the Disputed Domain Name <nvidiacorp.com> is comprised of: (a) the Complainant's trademark; (b) followed by the term "corp"; (c) followed by the gTLD ".com".

- the Disputed Domain Name <nvidiarecruits.com> is comprised of: (a) the Complainant's trademark; (b) followed by the term "recruits"; (c) followed by the gTLD ".com".

It is well established that the gTLD used as part of a domain name is generally disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11. The relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of each of the Disputed Domain Names, specifically: "nvidiacorp" and "nvidiarecruits", respectively.

The Panel finds that the mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Although, the addition of the terms such as "corp" or "recruits", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements in relation to the Disputed Domain Names, the Panel finds the addition of those terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names 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 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 disputed domain names (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.

The Panel finds that there is no indication that the Respondent was commonly known by the term "NVIDIA" prior to registration of the Disputed Domain Names. The Complainant has not licensed, permitted, or authorized the Respondent to use the trademark NVIDIA. The Panel also notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Names carries a risk of implied affiliation (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1).

The Panel notes the evidence that the Disputed Domain Names are inactive, but had active MX records, and were used to send email correspondence that attempted to perpetrate "a recruitment-themed phishing attack, with the intention of convincing members of the public to give out sensitive personal information", and finds that this does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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 Names. 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 Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the evidence in the case shows the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith.

On the issue of registration, taking into account the composition of the Disputed Domain Names and the distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant's trademark NVIDIA when it registered the Disputed Domain Names.

The Panel finds that there is no reason for the Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Names other than to trade off the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, a gap of several years between registration of a complainant's trademark and respondent's registration of a disputed domain name (containing the trademark) may indicate bad faith registration. In this case, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names more than 26 years after the Complainant established registered trademark rights in the NVIDIA mark. The Respondent has not come forward to rebut the Complainant's allegations or offer any alternative explanation.

On the issue of use, the Complainant's evidence is that the Disputed Domain Names do not currently resolve to active websites and have been used to send emails for the purpose of phishing or for other unlawful activities.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 Names <nvidiacorp.com> and <nvidiarecruits.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Weston/

Nicholas Weston

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2026