

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

mobilistics GmbH v. Vector Pulse, Vectorpulse
Case No. D2026-3053

1. The Parties

The Complainant is mobilistics GmbH, Germany, internally represented.

The Respondent is Vector Pulse, Vectorpulse, Sri Lanka, internally represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thevectorpulse.com> 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 10, 2026. On July 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 15, 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 (Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 15, 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 16, 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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 limited liability company established under German law in 2008, with its registered office in Dortmund, Germany. The Complainant is an information technology services company offering a variety of software and consultancy services, as described on the Complainant's German-language website at "www.mobilistics.de". The last of the four branded services described on the home page of the Complainant's website is VECTORPULSE, which concerns artificial intelligence (AI) software research and consultancy services.

The Complainant began using this mark publicly on August 4, 2025, also registering the domain name <vectorpulse.fr>. The Complaint attaches documentation showing that by September 5, 2025, the Complainant had registered the domain name <vectorpulse.de>, which was publicly served over HTTPS by that date. (The domain name <vectorpulse.fr> redirects to the Complainant's German-language website at <vectorpulse.de>.)

The Complainant also applied on August 4, 2025, to register VECTORPULSE as a European Union Trade Mark, obtaining Registration Number 019227916 as a word mark in International Classes 9 and 42 on December 5, 2025.

The disputed domain name was created on September 30, 2025, and is registered to the Respondent, listed in the registration details as Vector Pulse of the organization "Vectorpulse", with a postal address in Sri Lanka. The Response and the attached purchase receipt for registering the disputed domain name clarify that the Respondent is not an individual but rather a self-described "startup company" operating in Sri Lanka named Vector Pulse Software Company and evidently both trading as "Vectorpulse" and using "Vector Pulse" as its "official brand name".

The disputed domain name resolves to the Respondent's English-language website at "www.thevectorpulse.com" headed with a logo consisting of a capital letter "V" and the name "vectorpulse" in lower-case letters, followed by the tagline, "Where Innovation Finds Its Pulse". Consistent with the September 2025 registration date for the disputed domain name, the Respondent's website has the earmarks of a startup business: the home page cites just "6 Team Members", "5+ Clients Helped", and "5+ Projects Completed". The "Services" page of the website advertises software and development services, UI (user interface) / UX (user experience) design services, digital marketing, and services related to web hosting and infrastructure. The "About Us" page introduces six founders with photos and biographical information, including the Chief Operating Officer who submitted the Response in this proceeding. The "Contact" page provides contact details for the company, as well as a web form for site visitors to send a message or furnish their own contact details. The Respondent's website displays links to social media accounts, but these appear to be inoperative. The team members' individual LinkedIn profiles, however, contain posts about the Respondent's recent client projects. ¹

¹Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

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 its registered VECTORPULSE word mark, adding only the word "the". The Complainant states that the Respondent has no permission to use the Complainant's mark and that there is no evidence that the Respondent was commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name before registering it. The Complainant argues that adopting a corresponding trading name does not itself "generate rights or legitimate interests" and that the Respondent's online offering of IT (information technology) services that are similar to, and in direct competition with, the Complainant's services do not constitute a "bona fide offering of goods or services", because they capitalize on the reputation associated with the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent was aware, or should have been aware, of the Complainant's mark when registering the disputed domain name on September 30, 2025, because the mark had been in public use online since August 2025 and the Complainant's European Union Trade Mark application was published on August 27, 2025. "The coincidence of an identical invented mark and an overlapping field of activity, adopted weeks after publication of the Complainant's application, cannot plausibly be explained other than by knowledge of, and targeting of, the Complainant's mark." The Complainant asserts that the Respondent attempted to misdirect Internet users to the Respondent's site for commercial gain and cites the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name through a domain privacy service as further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not established all of the elements of the Complaint. The Respondent observes that the Complainant registered its trademark on December 5, 2025, after the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on November 30, 2025. The Respondent denies that it registered the disputed domain name in bad faith to target or impersonate that Complainant and asserts out that it could not attack a mark that did not yet exist; moreover, the disputed domain name is not identical to the Complainant's mark. The Respondent states that it has spent "millions" developing a company with a corresponding name and legitimately registered the disputed domain name and has used it legitimately for that company's business.

6. Discussion and Findings

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, the registered VECTORPULSE word mark, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the leading article “the”) 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.

The Panel finds that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as reflected in the Respondent’s website described above. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2. The IT start-up business described on the website and reflected in the principals’ LinkedIn profiles has the appearance of a genuine, small-scale IT consultancy called Vector Pulse Software Company based in Sri Lanka, advertising its services in the English language and using the names “Vector Pulse” or “vectorpulse” for marketing. Thus, there are indicia of an active business concern, rather than merely an AI-generated phishing website. This would satisfy the example of rights or legitimate interests described in the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i), so long as the evidence does not indicate that the Respondent chose these names (as well as the disputed domain name) to exploit the Complainant’s reputation, as the Complainant charges. That possibility is addressed below in discussing the third element, bad faith.

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. All of these instances, including paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the intentional creation of a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark for commercial gain, require a reasonable deduction that the respondent was aware of the complainant and meant to attack its mark, as the Complainant infers.

The Respondent denies such intent. The Complainant’s mark is invented, but it is also composed of two English words that are often used metaphorically to suggest direction and energy, and it is not improbable that both Parties would seize upon them for this value. The Respondent’s website speaks of “defining the pulse of tomorrow”, and the disputed domain name reflects the Respondent’s choice of company and trading name as well as a corresponding domain name. The Respondent’s denial of targeting the Complainant’s mark is credible in the circumstances, not only because the Complainant’s mark was not yet registered but more importantly because it was unlikely that the Respondent had seen the trademark application or the Complainant’s recent use of the trademark, or that the Respondent would find value in emulating it. While both Parties are in the very broad industry of “information technology”, the Complainant’s VECTORPULSE services are aimed at AI research and development. This is not the expertise advertised by the Respondent, which offers to help companies establish and grow their online presence. The Panel notes that the Complainant’s websites are in the German language, with content that repeatedly refers to the German

marketplace, while the Respondent is based in Sri Lanka and publishes content online in English. There is no evidence in the record or from the Complainant's website of extensive marketing beyond Germany or a likelihood that the Respondent in Sri Lanka would be aware of the Complainant and its new VECTORPULSE offering and of its (then) pending application for a European Union Trade Mark. Moreover, the fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name using a domain privacy service is not probative, as this is a commonplace practice for reasons such as avoiding spam and identity theft.

In sum, the evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

The same factual analysis confirms the Panel's finding under the second element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: August 24, 2026