

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Avixa, Inc. v. Mohamed Adel
Case No. D2026-2984

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Avixa, Inc., United States of America, represented by Venable, LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Mohamed Adel, Egypt.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <avexapro.com> is registered with Register.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 7, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 12, 2026, requesting the possibility to explore settlement options. On July 13, 2026, the Center invited the Complainant to submit a request for suspension of the proceeding by July 18, 2026, in the event that it wished to explore such settlement options. On July 15, 2026, the Complainant intimated that it did not wish to request a suspension of the proceeding. The Respondent sent another email communication and filed the Response on July 15 and 16, 2026, respectively. On July 17, 2026, the Complainant submitted a supplemental filing.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on August 3, 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 professional trade association for the audio visual (“AV”) industry, describing itself as representing more than 3,000 enterprise members and over 20,000 AV professionals in more than 80 countries. Its activities include organizing AV industry trade shows (including a conference named “InfoComm”), educational training and webinars, professional certifications, standards development for the AV industry, and other membership services.

The Complainant is the owner of the AVIXA word mark and the AVIXA and Design mark and lists multiple trademark registrations for these marks in the United States of America, United Kingdom, United Arab Emirates, and European Union. The Complainant states it has used the said marks in connection with its website at “www.avixa.org” since April 27, 2016, supported by RDAP lookup data for the associated domain name showing registration as of that date.

For example, the Complainant is the owner of United Kingdom Registered Trade Mark Number 3210336 for the word mark AVIXA, registered on July 7, 2017 (with priority date of January 12, 2017) in Classes 9, 16, 35, 41, and 42.

The Complainant is also the owner of United Kingdom Registered Trade Mark Number 3253017 consisting of a figurative mark in the form of a stylized geometric design formed by two adjoining isosceles-triangle-like shapes rendered in a graduated orange-to-pink color scheme, registered on February 2, 2018 in Classes 9, 16, 35, 41, and 42. Said figurative mark has the following appearance:



The Complainant is also the owner of United Kingdom Registered Trade Mark Number 3253020 consisting of a device and word mark in the form of the same stylized geometric design described in connection with the preceding mark, with the word AVIXA superimposed so that the leftmost line of the device matches the slope of the first letter “A” and the last letter “A” is slightly excised from the figure, registered on February 16, 2018 in Classes 9, 16, 35, 41, and 42. Said figurative mark has the following appearance:



According to the Registrar’s verification response, the disputed domain name was registered on January 5, 2023. The “About Us” page of the website associated with the disputed domain name describes its operator, AVEXA PRO LTD (capitalized as such) as headquartered in London, United Kingdom, while its “Privacy Policy” page lists contact details for the Respondent with a United Kingdom mobile telephone number (denoted by the prefix “+44 7”). The website’s footer separately lists office locations in the United States of America, United Kingdom, and United Arab Emirates, and contact email addresses at the disputed domain name. This may be contrasted with the Registrar’s verification record, which recorded the registrant’s postal address as Nasr City, Egypt.

The homepage displays the following logo in the form of a stylized geometric design closely approaching that of the Complainant's above figurative marks, formed by two adjoining isosceles-triangle-like shapes, however rendered in different colors, but featuring effectively the same graduation of tones (here, from light blue to green) over which the word "AVEXA" is superimposed so that the leftmost line of the device matches the slope of the first letter "A" and the last letter "A" is slightly excised from the figure. Beneath this word is the capitalized word "PRO" in slightly smaller letters. There is also the registered trademark symbol "®" above the right-most letter "A". This has the following appearance and is placed beside the Complainant's United Kingdom Registered Trade Mark Number 3253020 for comparison purposes.



The operator of the website associated with the disputed domain name is described as "Your AV & ELV Partner for End-to-End Solutions", offering "high-impact AV and ELV (Extra-Low Voltage) solutions tailored for commercial, educational, and corporate environments", and operating an online store for AV accessories, cables, mounts, and control gear. A carousel on the homepage under the banner "Our Partners in Success" displays a series of third-party logos, which in the Complainant's screenshot dated July 4, 2026 shows an included logo labelled "AVIXA Member", featuring the Complainant's word mark with the shape-only figurative mark above the letter "I" of the logo.

The Response is prepared by Mohamed Abushokr of AVEXA PRO LTD. An email and various exhibits produced in the Respondent's documentary annexes link this personal name to the Respondent's name, notably invoices from Shopify International Limited, which are addressed to AvexaPro / [email address at the disputed domain name] / Mohamed Adel. A further link is to be found in an invoice dated January 5, 2023, from "Weebly" apparently for the registration of an unspecified domain name, where the account name is "Mohamed Shokr", but the invoice is stated to have been paid by "mohamed adel". The Panel therefore accepts that the name "Mohamed Abushokr" is effectively an alias for the Respondent's name, or vice-versa, or at least that the names are very closely affiliated.

The Respondent's documentary annexes set out an asserted chronology for its "Avexa Pro" project, said to be supported by the following exhibits:

- the said invoice apparently relating to the registration of the disputed domain name dated January 5, 2023,
- a screenshot which is said to be of a Facebook page (although the image is truncated) dated February 12, 2023, showing the "Avexa Pro" name, the Respondent's above logo, and what is said to be an earlier version of the logo, and limited business contact details consisting of the disputed domain name and a related email address,
- invoices said to evidence website development activity via Weebly and Shopify International Limited dated between December 18, 2023, and March 24, 2026, and documents said to evidence (1) the formation of AVEXA PRO LTD in the United Kingdom on December 30, 2024 under company number 16155399, (2) a United Kingdom Data Protection Registration Certificate dated July 25, 2025, and (3) a United Kingdom Value Added Tax registration for the said company dated March 15, 2025,
- various Shopify development and hosting invoices dating between December 24, 2024 and March 24, 2026,
- records evidencing a prior AVIXA membership addressed to "Avexa Pro" of Dubai, United Arab Emirates, dating from June 19, 2024, to May 23, 2025,

- documents said to evidence preparations to attend the Complainant's InfoComm 2026 conference, including a conference registration, hotel booking confirmation, and an email indicating the provision of a free exhibit hall pass to such conference, noting that the Response also references visa application documentation, which was not contained within the Respondent's exhibits,
- an extract from United Kingdom Companies House showing three live companies using the term "AVEXA" (some seven further "AVEXA" named companies being dissolved or in liquidation, and several others being named "AVEX"), and
- a side-by-side comparison of the Complainant's said word and device mark with the Respondent's logo. In particular, the Respondent focuses on a horizontal line to the right from the top of the logo and to the left from the bottom. Such line is not visible on the logo on its website.

The Complainant reproduces screenshots of the Respondent's post on the LinkedIn platform representing that the Respondent exhibited at the Complainant's InfoComm 2026 conference. The post states "Great to meet with our partners and clients at InfoComm 2026. Valuable discussions, new connections and exciting opportunities ahead. Looking forward to future collaborations and innovative AV projects". This statement appears above a picture of an "AVEXA PRO" branded stand in what appears to be an exhibition hall (given the lighting, and the presence of other, partially obscured, stands on each side).

The Complainant provides a screenshot, dated July 6, 2026, of a search for "Avexa" on the official InfoComm 2026 exhibitor-gallery webpage, which returns "0 Results for Exhibitor List".

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, first, that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its AVIXA trademarks. It submits that the disputed domain name reproduces an almost identical version of its said marks with only one letter altered (the substitution of the letter "e" for the letter "i"), combined with the descriptive term "pro", which the Complainant says compounds rather than dispels the likelihood of confusion given that the Complainant's organization is itself a professional membership association. The Complainant submits that the ".com" suffix does nothing to distinguish the disputed domain name from its said AVIXA marks, and that the Respondent's website further reproduces the Complainant's AVIXA device mark without authorization on its homepage, which the Complainant says reinforces the connection between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's marks.

The Complainant contends, secondly, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, adding that it has never authorized the Respondent to register the disputed domain name or to use its AVIXA marks, that the disputed domain name was registered in January 2023, more than seven years after the Complainant's asserted first use of the AVIXA mark, that the Respondent was not previously known by "AVEXA", and that the Respondent's use of a near-identical mark and a virtually identical design logo, on a website offering competing AV industry goods and services, is designed to take advantage of the Complainant's goodwill rather than reflecting any independent right or legitimate interest. The Complainant further points to the "AVIXA Member" badge displayed on the Respondent's homepage, contending that while the Respondent may previously have held such membership, it is not currently a member, and that this representation is itself evidence against any legitimate interest.

Thirdly, the Complainant contends the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It submits that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark rights prior to registering the disputed domain name, relying upon the Respondent's historical AVIXA membership and its continued (but no longer accurate) representation of "AVIXA Member" status on the website associated with the disputed domain name. The Complainant further relies on the Respondent's LinkedIn representations that it exhibited at the Complainant's InfoComm 2026 conference, contrasted with the Complainant's search of the official InfoComm exhibitor directory for "Avexa", which returned no results. The Complainant thereby argues that the Respondent has made false representations of association with the Complainant to drive traffic to the disputed domain name for its own commercial gain. The Complainant contends that the cumulative effect of these matters, awareness of the Complainant's prior rights, use of a near-identical mark and logo, and false representations of affiliation and event participation, establishes registration and use in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent denies that the disputed domain name was registered or is being used in bad faith. It submits that "Avexa Pro" is a genuine business project, independently conceived and developed since January 2023, prior to any notice of the dispute.

As to its claim to rights or legitimate interests, the Respondent contends that it has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of services, namely AV and ELV consulting, programming and related engineering. It adds that the disputed domain name corresponds to its registered company name, AVEXA PRO LTD, and that it was not acquired for resale, disruption, or any purpose targeting the Complainant. It submits that the time between the registration of the disputed domain name (January 2023) and the incorporation of its said company (December 30, 2024) reflects the ordinary process of developing a business concept prior to formal incorporation, and that its Facebook presence, Weebly and Shopify development records, and company formation documents together demonstrate continuous, genuine development of the project.

The Respondent contends that its logo was independently developed and is materially distinguishable from the AVIXA and Design mark by reason of its color scheme, its incorporation of the word "PRO", the wording difference between "AVEXA PRO" and "AVIXA", additional design elements (horizontal lines above and below the graphic), the presence of a registered trademark symbol "®", and the different branding context in which it appears. It also submits that "AVEXA" is used by numerous unrelated third parties and is not exclusively associated with either of the Parties.

Regarding the AVIXA membership representation, the Respondent states that it was previously a genuine member of the Complainant's association and that any reference to that status reflects an actual historical relationship rather than an intent to mislead. On the InfoComm references, the Respondent states that it made genuine preparations to attend the Complainant's InfoComm 2026 conference, evidenced by a conference registration, hotel reservation, and United States of America visa-application materials (the latter not supplied in its exhibits, as noted above), and submits that the related social media posts were not intended to mislead the public.

As to the issue of bad faith, the Respondent denies having attempted to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant or any third party, states that it has not registered a pattern of domain names targeting the Complainant, and asserts that it has not sought to disrupt the Complainant's business. It contends that the disputed domain name has become operationally integral to its business, as it is used for client correspondence, banking, and communications with governmental and tax authorities, such that it is not a speculative registration but the digital identity of an active, legitimate business. While maintaining its denial of the allegations, the Respondent states it remains willing to consider reasonable measures to reduce any unintended confusion.

C. Complainant's Supplemental Filing

Following receipt of the Response, the Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing objecting to the admissibility and probative value of several of the Respondent's exhibits, on the basis that these matters could not have been anticipated when the Complaint was filed.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent's alleged domain name registration invoice is irrelevant because the Respondent does not dispute the Complainant's trademark rights predating the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant notes that the Respondent's alleged Facebook screenshot is undated, lacks any URL, and does not depict the logo actually used in connection with the disputed domain name. It submits that the Weebly and Shopify records are irrelevant, being evidence only of the Respondent's own payments to third-party platform providers rather than of any prior rights or of consumer-facing commercial activity predating the Complainant's rights or the registration of the disputed domain name. It asserts that the various company documents are similarly irrelevant to the question of the Complainant's prior rights, and adds that the InfoComm travel materials do not answer the Complaint's core allegation, namely that the Respondent represented, falsely (by means of what the Complainant characterizes as an image generated by artificial intelligence) that the Respondent had exhibited at InfoComm 2026, when the official exhibitor search shows that it did not. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's alleged example of third-party use of AVEXA is undated, lacks URLs, and does not show that the referenced entities operate in the AV industry or have used the Complainant's registered marks or design logo without authorization, noting that the majority of the listed entities appear to be dissolved.

The Complainant does not dispute the contents of the AVIXA membership records relating to the Respondent, but submits that these in fact support a finding of bad faith, as they demonstrate the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights prior to registration of the disputed domain name. As to the Respondent's comparison between the Complainant's mark and the Respondent's logo, the Complainant submits that the Respondent's use of a registered-trademark symbol within its own logo, notwithstanding that the Respondent does not claim any registered trademark in "AVEXA", is itself improper and supports rather than rebuts a finding of bad faith.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue: Complainant's Supplemental Filing

Paragraph 12 of the Rules expressly provides that it is for the panel to request, in its sole discretion, any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case. Unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.6.

Panels have sole discretion, under paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, whether to accept an unsolicited supplemental filing from either party, bearing in mind the need for procedural efficiency, and the obligation to treat each party with equality and ensure that each party has a fair opportunity to present its case. The party submitting a supplemental filing would normally need to show its relevance to the case and explain why it was unable to provide that information in the complaint or response (for example, owing to some exceptional circumstance).

As noted in the procedural history section above, the Complainant filed a supplemental filing on July 17, 2026. This was confined to comments on the Respondent's various exhibits as described in the factual background section above and, itself, introduced no new evidence. Consequently, the Panel considered it reasonable to admit the supplemental filing on the basis that both of the Parties have been treated with equality, and that each has had a fair opportunity to present its case in accordance with paragraph 10(b) of the Rules.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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

The first element of the disputed domain name "avexa" differs from the Complainant's word mark by a substitution of the letter "i" with the letter "e". It has long been recognized by panels under the Policy that a domain name consisting of a variation of a trademark, including by substitution of one or more characters, is confusingly similar to the relevant mark for the purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms, here, the word "pro", 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 applicable Top-Level Domain in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") (here, ".com") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out the requisite prima facie case on the basis of its contentions that it has not authorized the Respondent's use of its AVIXA trademark, that the disputed domain name was registered years after the Complainant's trademarks, and the Respondent's website reproduces a logo that is a close imitation of the Complainant's registered device and word mark. The essence of the Respondent's case in rebuttal is that the disputed domain name corresponds to its company name and has been used for a bona fide offering of AV services before notice to it of the dispute, and further, that the branding of "AVEXA PRO" is independently developed and materially distinct from the Complainant's AVIXA trademarks.

Before dealing specifically with the evidence in this case, the Panel reminds itself that even when officially registered, a corporate name does not typically, on its own, lead to a finding of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy (*Royal Bank of Canada v. RBC Bank*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0672](#)). Furthermore, although evidence of the registration of a business name may be submitted to support a respondent's case, panels are not likely to give a mere business name registration the same weight as a trademark registration, and would expect evidence of use of the business name (beyond mere corporate registration documents) to also be provided in a way that links the business name to the source of specific goods or services.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.12.1.

Reviewing the record as a whole, the Panel does not consider that the Respondent's case in answer is sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case, even taken at its highest. The documentary record establishes that, commencing in early 2023, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, incurred some expenses, made some public postings on social media, incorporated a company, and registered the entity concerned for taxation and data protection purposes. However, even if these activities might typically demonstrate preparations to commence a genuine business, they do not create rights or legitimate interests under the Policy in this case because the business itself (at least as shown on the website associated with the disputed domain name) is being conducted under branding that intentionally trades on the Complainant's mark, as the Panel discusses below.

The wider context in the present case is critical, in that the Respondent's branding choices, exemplified by the disputed domain name, were, more probably than not, strongly influenced by its familiarity with the AVIXA name and the AVIXA device and word mark. This familiarity is most likely to have arisen due to the Respondent's interest in the AV space in which the Complainant operates as a membership organization. It also cannot be overlooked that at least as of the date of filing of the Complaint, the Respondent's own website had continued to display an "AVIXA Member" badge in its partner carousel despite the fact that the Respondent was not a member at that point, according to the uncontradicted assertion of the Complainant.

The Respondent seeks to claim rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name despite the fact (1) that it operates in the AV marketplace with which the Complainant is closely aligned, (2) that the dominant element of the disputed domain name, "avexa", is one letter different from the Complainant's word mark, (3) that the additional term "pro" is a common abbreviation of "professional" (in turn echoing the Complainant's activities as the organizer of a professional membership association for the AV industry), (4) that the Respondent's logo is visually highly similar to the Complainant's prior device and word mark and is identical in shape, text placing, and graduated tones to the Complainant's prior device mark, and (5) that the Respondent's website was, at the point when the Complaint was filed, prominently misrepresenting an ongoing affiliation with the Complainant that no longer existed.

In all of those circumstances, even if the Respondent's underlying commercial activity might on its own be considered genuine (as to which there is only limited evidence before the Panel), the Respondent's current use of the disputed domain name and adoption of the "AVEXA PRO" name cannot support a claim to rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. Use of a domain name that is derivative of and intentionally trades off the goodwill vested in a complainant's trademark could not be described as a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent's submissions and evidence therefore do not amount to a rebuttal of the Complainant's prima facie case.

In reaching this conclusion, the Panel notes for completeness that it also considered the Respondent's list of alleged third-party users of the name "AVEXA". This was put forward in support of the Respondent's assertion that it adopted the disputed domain name independently of the Complainant's rights, which assertion the Panel has dismissed in its analysis above. As far as the list itself is concerned, only limited weight can be applied to this evidence. In the first place, very few live companies were shown to have adopted this particular moniker. In the second place, there is no evidence that any of the referenced entities operate in the Complainant's field of AV or make use of a similar logo to the Complainant's device mark, as the Respondent does. Given that the Respondent has effectively based its trading style on that of the Complainant and is free riding on the goodwill inherent in the Complainant's AVIXA mark, the fact that there

might be other companies or businesses called “AVEXA” does not support its case that it adopted the name independently of the Complainant and its rights.

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.

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 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.

The Panel finds the following circumstances, taken cumulatively, establish bad faith registration and use in the present case. First, on the question of the Respondent’s prior knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks at the point of registration, the Respondent’s own evidence of its AVIXA membership reinforces the notion that, more probably than not, it registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant’s rights, even if such membership might have commenced somewhat later than the date of registration of the disputed domain name. This is supported by other reasonable inferences of the Respondent’s likely knowledge based upon the fact that the Respondent’s website operates within the same AV industry in which the Complainant also operates and to which its association caters, and from the Respondent’s deliberate emulation of the Complainant’s brand as discussed further below.

Secondly, the Respondent chose to use a logo on the website associated with the disputed domain name that, per the Complaint’s visual comparison, closely emulates the Complainant’s word and device mark in shape, typeface, and graduation of color. The differences that the Respondent points out in its own comparison, namely the color, spelling, use of the “®” symbol, and the addition of the word “PRO” in small letters, are insufficient to distinguish the logo from the mark. The alleged horizontal lines in the Respondent’s comparison are either not present or not visible on the logo featuring on the website associated with the disputed domain name, and in any event do not give rise to a substantive visual difference. The logo’s two-triangle-style distinctive shape is an exact match, the placement of the dominant word is identical (albeit with the single letter substitution), the typeface appears identical, and the colors, although different, feature the same graduated shading. The overall impression is highly similar, and the Panel considers that this could not be coincidental but rather demonstrates both prior knowledge of, and an intent to target, the Complainant’s mark.

Thirdly, the Respondent’s website continued, at least up to the date of the Complaint, to represent an “AVIXA Member” affiliation that, in the Complainant’s uncontradicted assertion, no longer exists. This is a representation apt to mislead AV professionals (effectively, the Complainant’s audience for its membership services and the Respondent’s customers and/or professional colleagues) as to sponsorship or endorsement of such website consistent with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Fourthly, the Respondent’s representations on LinkedIn concerning its allegedly having exhibited at the Complainant’s own InfoComm 2026 conference tend to undermine the credibility of the Respondent’s case in general. When challenged on the matter, the Respondent claimed that it had genuine plans to attend, which it said were supported by the hotel reservation and registration for a free exhibit hall pass, which it produced. It also mentioned visa application documentation but did not produce this. However, the Respondent’s comments and its exhibits miss the point. What matters here is not whether the Respondent genuinely planned to attend the event. It is that the Respondent publicly indicated on LinkedIn not only that it had actually attended the conference, when it had not, but also that it had been an exhibitor and not just a pass holder to the exhibit hall, based upon an image which it published of an exhibition stand branded “AVEXA PRO”.

The image posted by the Respondent suggested, in context, that it had been taken of the Respondent's stand at the event, as it was accompanied by the text "Great to meet with our partners and clients at InfoComm 2026". The Complainant shows by way of the official exhibitor search results that the Respondent did not exhibit at the event, and the Response does not contradict this. Faced with this context, the Respondent could not (and in fact did not attempt to) argue that the image was promotional or aspirational material, that it had intended to use, rather than a representation that it actually exhibited. Consequently, the Respondent's apparent falsehood deliberately misrepresents an association with the Complainant's event that it did not have. Furthermore, it indirectly suggests that the Complainant was content to allow a brand named "AVEXA PRO" to exhibit at its event, or at least acquiesced in this, when it did neither. The deliberately misleading nature of the post does not inspire much confidence as to the credibility and reliability of the other aspects of the Respondent's case, notably its claim of independent development of its brand identity.

The Respondent asserts that it is engaged in a genuine, active, and legitimate business following upon incorporation of its limited company in the United Kingdom. It notes that it makes reliance upon the disputed domain name for client communications, banking and finance, tax compliance, and supplier correspondence. However, the fact that a party may have an operating business does not immunize it from the consequences of trademark-abusive conduct in terms of the Policy. Weighing the evidence before it, the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to trade off the goodwill vested in the Complainant's predating trademarks, and that the Respondent misrepresented an affiliation with the Complainant for commercial gain. Consequently, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in 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 name <avexapro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/

Andrew D. S. Lothian

Sole Panelist

Date: August 17, 2026