

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gierd, Inc. v. Lim Marcus, Lumina Systems Pte. Ltd., Darren Lim Wei Jie
NovaLink Technologies Pte. Ltd., Jia HuiChen, NexoraTechPteLtd and
Kalialex
Case No. D2026-2457

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Gierd, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Thompson & Co., United States.

The Respondents are Lim Marcus, Lumina Systems Pte. Ltd., Singapore, Darren Lim Wei Jie, Hong Kong, China, NovaLink Technologies Pte. Ltd., Jia HuiChen, NexoraTechPteLtd, Singapore, Kalialex, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <gierdag.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Onamae.com.

The disputed domain names <gierdagt.com> and <gierdnet.com> are registered with Name SRS AB.

The disputed domain names <gierdbrand.com>, <gierdframer.com> and <gierd.it.com>¹ are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd.

The disputed domain name <gierdlog.cc> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited.

The abovementioned registrars are referred to collectively as the "Registrars".

¹ The Panel notes that <gierd.it.com> is a third-level domain name falling under the .it.com Dispute Resolution Policy which provides that the registrants agree to abide by the results of a UDRP proceeding if informal resolution in coordination with IT.com Domains is unsuccessful. The Complainant has provided evidence that it filed an abuse complaint with IT.com Domains, and the Panel has received no confirmation that any settlement had taken place under the it.com Dispute Resolution Procedure. The Panel will accordingly proceed to a decision under the UDRP.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 4, 2026. On June 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 8, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Whois Privacy Protection Service, Protected Protected, Redacted for Privacy, Private Person) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 9, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants 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 10, 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 5, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Jane Seager as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States. The Complainant operates an intelligent unified marketplace-commerce platform under the GIERD mark at “www.gierd.com”. The Complainant asserts it has used the GIERD mark continuously in commerce since at least as early as June 30, 2022, in connection with its services².

The Complaint is based on the following trademark registrations:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 8230520, GIERD, registered on April 28, 2026, filed on September 19, 2025; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 8239994, GIERD (and design), registered on May 5, 2026, filed on September 19, 2025.

The disputed domain names were registered over a period of approximately seven weeks, between March 9, 2026, and April 27, 2026, as follows:

² Noting the general powers of a panel under paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel independently verified, through the Internet Archive, that the GIERD mark had been used in connection with the website located at “www.gierd.com” as early as October 28, 2022.

Disputed Domain Name:	Registration Date:
<gierdbrand.com>	March 9, 2026
<gierdframer.com>	March 9, 2026
<gierdlog.cc>	March 11, 2026
<gierdag.com>	March 25, 2026
<gierd.it.com>	March 26, 2026
<gierdagt.com>	April 24, 2026
<gierdnet.com>	April 27, 2026

At the time the Complaint was submitted, the following six of the seven disputed domain names were configured either to display or redirect to content that closely replicated the Complainant's own home page: <gierdag.com>, <gierdagt.com>, <gierdbrand.com>, <gierdframer.com>, <gierdnet.com>, and <gierd.it.com>. Specifically, four of these disputed domain names (<gierdag.com>, <gierdagt.com>, <gierdbrand.com>, and <gierdframer.com>) redirected to the disputed domain name <gierd.it.com>, which hosted a close copy of the Complainant's home page, including the GIERD word mark, logo, tagline, and marketing copy. The disputed domain name <gierdnet.com> hosted a standalone copy of the same home page on the same backend infrastructure. These six disputed domain names appear to have been used as part of a coordinated fraudulent scheme impersonating the Complainant. According to evidence submitted by the Complainant, Internet users were recruited through purported employment or agent opportunities and were induced to make payments through a platform falsely represented as being associated with the Complainant. According to the Complainant, the remaining disputed domain name, <gierdlog.cc>, displayed a landing page that cloned the home page of an open-source "PageSpy" remote-debugging tool, and was hosted on the same shared infrastructure as the other disputed domain names.

At the time of this Decision, none of the disputed domain names resolves to an active website.

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.

The Complainant asserts rights in the GIERD trademark. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to its GIERD trademark.

The Complainant states that it has not licensed or authorized the Respondents' use of the GIERD trademark. The Complainant submits that the Respondents are not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor are the Respondents making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. Instead, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are being used to operate a fraudulent platform impersonating the Complainant and soliciting payments from targeted Internet users.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names with actual knowledge of the GIERD trademark, as evidenced by the reproduction of the Complainant's website and associated fraudulent scheme. The pattern of abusive registration, disruption of the Complainant's business, intentional attraction of users for commercial gain by creating confusion, use for phishing and impersonation, concealment of identity, and the timing of registrations all demonstrate bad faith under the Policy.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint 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 (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes a number of factors pointing to a single actor or coordinated group acting under common control. First, the disputed domain names were registered within a short period between March 2026 and April 2026. Second, the evidence shows that all seven disputed domain names were linked through common technical infrastructure, including resolution to the same hosting IP address and, in six cases, use of closely related name server configurations. Third, six of the seven disputed domain names either redirected to, or displayed content copied from, the Complainant's website, reproducing the Complainant's GIERD mark, logo, branding, tagline, and website content. Fourth, six of the disputed domain names were used in connection with what appears to be a common fraudulent scheme targeting Internet users through impersonation of the Complainant and solicitation of payments.

The Panel further notes that the Registrar-disclosed underlying registrant information contains multiple similarities and apparent inconsistencies, including overlapping postal codes, similar naming conventions, use of apparently fictitious corporate entities, and email addresses following similar patterns. These circumstances provide further support for a finding of common control.

Taking all of these circumstances together, the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

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 Matters

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate on the balance of probabilities that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (i) The disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) The disputed domain names were 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 name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has demonstrated rights in the GIERD trademark through its United States trademark registrations. The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established rights in a trademark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. In the case of <gierd.it.com>, the Third-Level string "gierd" wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "ag", "agt", "brand", "framer", "net", and "log") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademark 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 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 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 notes that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise consented to the Respondent's use or registration of the GIERD mark or any domain name incorporating that mark. The record demonstrates that six of the disputed domain names either resolved to, or redirected Internet users to, websites reproducing the Complainant's branding and website content. The evidence further indicates that those websites formed part of a scheme in which Internet users were recruited as purported "agents" and were induced to make payments. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed phishing, copycat sites and fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel infers that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names with actual knowledge of the Complainant's GIERD mark, as evidenced by the reproduction of the Complainant's website at the web pages to which the majority of the disputed domain names resolved or redirected, coupled with the operation of a fraudulent online scheme. The Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered between March 9, 2026, and April 27, 2026, i.e., after the Complainant had adopted and used the GIERD trademark and some months after the Complainant had filed United States trademark applications for that mark. While the disputed domain names were registered before formal issuance of the trademark registrations relied on by the Complainant, the record shows that the Complainant had been using the GIERD mark in commerce since 2022. Given the Respondent's subsequent reproduction of the Complainant's website and branding, the Panel finds that the Respondent clearly had the Complainant and its then nascent trademark rights in mind when registering the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2. The Panel further considers the Respondent's registration of seven domain names incorporating the GIERD mark, across multiple registrars and using various forms of registrant concealment, amounts to a pattern of bad faith registration.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names, as described above, has exposed members of the public to a fraudulent online scheme and creates a risk of reputational harm for the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, impersonation and advance-fee fraud) 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 has separately considered the disputed domain name <gierdlog.cc>, which did not display the same website content as the other disputed domain names. However, the evidence shows that this disputed domain name was registered during the same period, resolved to the same underlying infrastructure, incorporated the Complainant's GIERD mark, and was sufficiently connected to the same overall pattern of conduct. In these circumstances and particularly given the absence of any apparent good-faith explanation for the registration, the Panel finds that <gierdlog.cc> was also registered and used in bad faith.

The fact that the disputed domain names currently do not resolve to active websites does not preclude the Panel's finding of bad faith.

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 <gierdag.com>, <gierdagt.com>, <gierdbrand.com>, <gierdframer.com>, <gierd.it.com>, <gierdlog.cc> and <gierdnet.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jane Seager/

Jane Seager

Sole Panelist

Date: August 18, 2026