

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

FIL Limited v. Prakash Reddy, B2P Foods Inc
Case No. D2026-2909

1. The Parties

The Complainant is FIL Limited, Bermuda, United Kingdom, represented by Mishcon de Reya LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Prakash Reddy, B2P Foods Inc, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fidelitycanada.org> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 2, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 3, 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 July 6, 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 July 9, 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 July 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 11, 2026. On August 14, 2026, an email communication was received from the Respondent by the Center.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on August 14, 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 multinational corporation providing inter alia fund and asset management services worldwide. It was established more than 50 years ago.

Since then, the Complainant has offered its services under the FIDELITY trademark. Among others, the Complainant is the owner of the United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003129598, registered on December 25, 2015, and the European Union Trademark Registration No. 14632021, registered on May 21, 2020, both for FIDELITY, and both covering protection inter alia for financial services in classes 35 and 36.

The Complainant further owns and operates websites at various domain names, including at <fidelity.ca> for its Canadian business.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Canada. According to provided excerpts from the Canadian Business Register, the organization associated with the Respondent was dissolved on February 28, 2022.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 3, 2021.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name was used to redirect users to the Complainant's own Canadian website at <fidelity.ca>. The Complainant has also provided evidence that a subdomain associated with the disputed domain name was used as a purported webmail portal for users.

At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name no longer 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 name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, the Center received an email communication from the Respondent on August 14, 2026, stating:

"I see the account was suspended long back by namecheap. Not sure who owns this domain and why we are getting these emails."

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Identity of the Respondent

The Panel notes that, in his email communication to the Center, the Respondent stated that it is "not sure who owns" the disputed domain name, even though this communication was sent from the email address provided by the Registrar as belonging to the registrant of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not specifically disputed the accuracy of the registrant information provided by the Registrar, nor has it submitted any evidence supporting the allegation that the disputed domain name is held by another person

or entity or that his contact information has been fraudulently used for the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered in 2021, i.e., prior to the dissolution of the organization associated with the Respondent in 2022. There is nothing in the record to suggest that the subsequent dissolution of that organization resulted in a transfer of the disputed domain name to another person or entity.

In these circumstances, the Panel sees no reason to depart from the registrant information confirmed by the Registrar and therefore considers the identified Respondent to be the proper Respondent in this administrative proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

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 shown rights in respect of the FIDELITY trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of other terms, here "canada", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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 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.

In this regard, the Panel particularly notes that the disputed domain name was used in connection with a subdomain which purported to be a webmail portal, asking users to provide their personal information such as email address. While the record does not establish whether any confidential information was actually obtained through this subdomain, such use, in the view of the Panel, indicates that the disputed domain name could be used for an illegal phishing attempt, which 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 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 notes that the Respondent likely had the Complainant and its FIDELITY trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent has likely chosen the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant’s well-known trademark in its entirety, to target and mislead Internet users searching for the Complainant and its services. The disputed domain name was used to host a subdomain inviting users to enter confidential information like email addresses and password details, and, according to the Complainant’s unrebutted allegations, was also used to redirect Internet users to the Complainant’s own website at <fidelity.ca>.

Such circumstances, taken together, support the Panel’s conclusion that the disputed domain name is used in bad faith to host a webmail login portal at the disputed domain name, inviting users to disclose their email addresses and passwords, likely for fraudulent purposes.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent has not contested the Complainant's allegations as well as has failed to come forward with any evidence of rights or legitimate interests or explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The fact that the disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith given the above-noted circumstances.

All in all, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 name <fidelitycanada.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: August 28, 2026