

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Micromine Australia Pty Ltd v. Andy Lange
Case No. D2026-2927

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Micromine Australia Pty Ltd, Australia, represented by The Weir Group PLC, Australia.

The Respondent is Andy Lange, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <micromine.world> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 3, 2026. On July 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 8, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 8, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not submit any amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that the 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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on August 6, 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

Founded in Western Australia in 1986, the Complainant is a provider of software solutions for use in the mining industry, which are offered under the trademark MICROMINE.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for MICROMINE, including the following:

- International trademark registration No. 1120276 for MICROMINE (word mark), registered on November 17, 2011, in classes 9 and 42;
- China trademark registration No. 4730394 for MICROMINE (word mark), filed on June 20, 2005, and registered on April 7, 2008, in class 9;
- Canada trademark registration No. TMA856476 for MICROMINE (word mark), filed on October 27, 2011, and registered on July 30, 2013, in classes 9, 16, 35, 37, 42, 44 and 45;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00801120276 for MICROMINE (word mark), filed on November 17, 2011, and registered on May 24, 2013, in classes 9 and 42;
- United States of America trademark registration No. 4287395 for MICROMINE (word mark), filed on November 17, 2011, and registered on February 12, 2013, in international classes 9 and 42.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <micromine.com>, which was registered on August 1, 1997, and is used by the Complainant to promote its products and services under the trademark MICROMINE.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 3, 2025, and is redirected to the Complainant's website "www.micromine.com".

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 <micromine.world> is identical to its registered trademark MICROMINE.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because: i) the Respondent has no rights over the trademark MICROMINE and has not been authorized to use the Complainant's trademark MICROMINE in the disputed domain name or in the course of commerce; ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and iii) the disputed domain name is redirected to the Complainant's official website "www.micromine.com".

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since: i) the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Complainant's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark; ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and iii) there is no conceivable good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put.

The Complainant also states that prior to this proceeding it sent email communications to the Registrar regarding the disputed domain name and asserts that "[t]he fact that the Registrar did not provide the details of the Respondent, ignored all type of communications to amicably solve this matter, is clear sign of bad faith insofar as the Respondent retains control over the redirection thus creating a real or implied ongoing threat to the Complainant".

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of valid trademark registrations for the word mark MICROMINE.

The entirety of the 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.

As to the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".world", it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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.

According to the evidence on record, the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark or the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent’s rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to the Complainant’s website and there is no evidence showing that the Respondent ever made use of, or preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use without intention to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the MICROMINE trademark.

In addition to the above, the disputed domain name, being identical to the Complainant’s trademark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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, in light of the prior registration and use of the trademark MICROMINE by the Complainant and the promotion of the Complainant’s trademark online via the website “www.micromine.com”, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, in view of the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark MICROMINE, the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's mark and the Respondent's redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's official website "www.micromine.com", the Panel finds that the Respondent was actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

As to the redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's website, prior panels have found that such use can demonstrate the respondent's intent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name has Mail eXchanger (MX) records and Sender Policy Framework (SPF) configured,¹ a circumstance suggesting the possible existence of email addresses based on the disputed domain name. Considering the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark and its redirection to the Complainant's official website, recipients of possible email messages from accounts based on the disputed domain name may believe such messages to be originating from the Complainant itself. Moreover, as indicated above, the Respondent did not provide any explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name. Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent appears to be attempting to impersonate the Complainant and induce Internet users to believe that the disputed domain name is owned and used by the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The third element of the Policy has been established as well.

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 <micromine.world> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: August 20, 2026

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.