

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

FloQast, Inc. v. Will Shrank, Aradigm
Case No. D2026-2582

1. The Parties

The Complainant is FloQast, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Pranger Law PC, United States.

The Respondent is Will Shrank, Aradigm, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <floqast.cloud> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 12, 2026. On June 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 16, 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 (Whois Privacy, Private by Design, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 16, 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 18, 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Angela Fox as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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 company based in the United States providing accountancy-related software and SaaS services. It has been carrying out these activities under the trademark FLOQAST since 2014. Since at least as early as that, the Complainant has operated a website at “www.floqast.com”, which it uses to promote its business under the FLOQAST trademark.

The Complainant is the proprietor of several trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including the following which were annexed to the Complaint:

- United States trademark registration No. 5141415 for FLOQAST (and Design) in Class 42, registered on February 14, 2017; and
- United States trademark registration No. 7747963 for #FLOQAST (and Design) in Class 42, registered on April 1, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 19, 2026. It is being used to redirect visitors to the Complainant's 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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FLOQAST trademark, because it consists of “floqast” and the Top-Level Domain, “cloud”. The Complainant submits that the Top-Level Domain is a standard registration requirement and is therefore insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's mark. To the extent that the Top-Level Domain is relevant, the Complainant submits that it is directly descriptive of an aspect of the Complainant's services, which can be cloud-based.

The Complainant also submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the FLOQAST trademark, is not a licensee of the Complainant, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the FLOQAST mark. The Respondent has not used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather has used the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's own website, in order to deceive individuals into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainant or that the Respondent is otherwise associated with Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The Respondent intentionally registered a domain name that was confusingly similar to the Complainant's FLOQAST mark and used it to redirect to the Complainant's own website in order to confuse and mislead Internet users. The redirect shows that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's FLOQAST mark and business and was targeting the Complainant in registering and using the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. No exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward. Therefore, in accordance with paragraphs 14 (a) and (b) of the Rules, the Panel will decide the Complaint and shall draw such inferences, as it considers appropriate from the Respondent's default.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant can only succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy if the panel finds that:

- (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 the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

All three elements must be present before a complainant can succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy.

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

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

The entirety of the FLOQAST mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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.

The use of a domain name that is identical to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of redirection to the Complainant's website does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.. The Panel notes the finding in *International Business Machines Corporation v. Priyanka k*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3744](#) that, "The use of the disputed domain name to redirect visitors to the Complainant's own website cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial use", and in *Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc. v. Ember Hits*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3886](#) that, "The use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's official website does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use". Such use trades on the association with the Complainant's mark and creates a misleading impression that the disputed domain name is owned, authorized, or operated by the Complainant.

Taking all of the above into account, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's website is a misrepresentation which does not give rise to a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes certain circumstances which, in particular, but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, such circumstances include that by using a disputed domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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 its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

Panels have moreover found that seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means, such as a re-direct) for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, and redirecting a domain name to or mimicking a complainant's website are relevant factors in considering whether paragraph 4(b)(iv) applies. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Additional relevant factors include the chosen Top-Level Domain (particularly where corresponding to the complainant's area of business activity or natural zone of expansion) and a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the respondent's choice of the domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In this case, the Complainant has shown evidence that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's own website. It is clear from this that the Respondent was aware of and was targeting the Complainant when it registered and used the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Top-Level Domain name here is ".cloud", which is descriptive of an element of the Complainant's services, which include online software which is hosted on the Internet, or in "the cloud". There is nothing to suggest that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as noted above.

The Respondent has made no effort to rebut the Complainant's allegations, despite having had the opportunity to do so.

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 <floqast.cloud> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angela Fox/

Angela Fox

Sole Panelist

Date: August 10, 2026