

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Anne-Marie LINDNER v. Daan Bijl, Topor Beheer B.V.
Case No. D2026-3162

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Anne-Marie LINDNER, Switzerland, represented by Laidebeur & Partners, Luxembourg.

The Respondent is Daan Bijl, Topor Beheer B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <prejex.global> and <prejex.world> are registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 17, 2026 regarding the disputed domain names and the domain name <prejex.com>. On July 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names and to the concerned registrar for the domain name <prejex.com>. On July 20 and 21, 2026, the registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names and the domain name <prejex.com> which differed from the named Respondent (The RDAP server redacted the value, REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 24, 2026, requesting the withdrawal of the domain name <prejex.com> from the Complaint. The Center issued Notification of (Requested) Partial Withdrawal on the same date for the domain name <prejex.com>.

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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2026. On August 13, 2026, the Respondent requested an additional four calendar days in which to respond to the Complaint as per paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, and the Center granted the extension on August 14, 2026. The new due date for Response was August 21, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on August 21, 2026. The Respondent filed a further submission on September 9, 2026. The Complainant sent an email communication in response on September 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor, William Lobelson, and Willem J. H. Leppink as panelists in this matter on September 15, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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 Background¹

The Complainant is a director of Prejex Holding S.A. and Prejex IP S.A., Luxembourg (“the Luxembourg Companies”), which the Complainant describes as “belonging to the PREJEX Group”.

The Respondent claims that it provides domain name management services for a German company called Prejex Holding GmbH (“PHG”), acting under the instructions of Mr. Stuut, a director of PHG.

Although neither party has clearly explained the relationship between the Luxembourg Companies, PHG and the other PREJEX entities mentioned in the record, it is apparent that they have been involved in the same or related PREJEX business activities. For convenience, the Panel refers below to those entities collectively as the “PREJEX Group”, without making any finding as to their precise corporate relationship.

The Panel understands that, from at least 2016, the PREJEX Group has engaged in the development and commercialisation of needle-free drug delivery systems under the PREJEX mark.

The Complainant says that <prejex.com> (not one of the disputed domain names) was first registered in 2015, but does not explain how it was used.

Until around December 2024 (see below), PHG was the holder of the following trade marks for PREJEX:

- German trade mark No. 302016222941, registered on November 22, 2016;
- German trade mark No. 302022101297, registered on March 3, 2022; and
- International trade mark No. 1759491, registered on August 2, 2023.

These are collectively referred to below as “the PREJEX Registered Trade Marks”. PHG likewise owned registered European Union Design No. 008730816-0001 for disposable syringes (the “EU Design”).

The Respondent states that on March 10, 2022, Chester Jansen of Founded 2010 BV registered the disputed domain name <prejex.global>. The Respondent states that Founded 2010 B.V. did so on behalf of PHG.

¹ The findings in the section are based partly on factual information supplied in the original Complaint, which is relevant in this proceeding for reasons explained below.

In its original Complaint, the Complainant provided a link² to a www.archive.org (“Internet Archive”) version of a website at the disputed domain name <prejex.global> dated April 14, 2024, which the Complainant describes as “the official PREJEX website presenting the company’s needle-free injection technology, products and applications”.

The Panel has reviewed³ the Internet Archive version of the “Team” page⁴ of the website as of February 24, 2024, and noted that this listed the Complainant as “COO”, Maarten Stuut as “CEO”, and Chester Jansen as “CIO”, and it also included a “2023 Prejex GMBH” copyright notice in the footer (which the Panel takes as shorthand for PHG).

In the period December 2024 to February 2025, the PREJEX Registered Trade Marks and the EU Design were transferred from PHG to Prejex Holding S.A.

As of July 13, 2025, according to a screenshot annexed to the original Complaint, the domain name <prejex.com> redirected to the disputed domain name <prejex.global>.

According to documentation annexed to the original Complaint, on November 11, 2025, the Complainant entered into agreements to provide loans to the Luxembourg Companies. On November 12 and 13, 2025, those companies pledged certain intellectual property rights to the Complainant as security for the loans. The assets listed by Prejex Holding S.A. included the PREJEX Registered Trade Marks as well as the disputed domain name <prejex.global> and the domain name <prejex.com>, plus the EU Design.

The Complainant says that, on January 27, 2026, it demanded repayment of the loans and that, as a consequence of non-payment, the Complainant thereafter enforced the pledges. The Complainant has supplied a deed executed on March 20 and 21, 2026, whereby Prejex Holding S.A. transferred the PREJEX Registered Trade Marks and the EU Design to the Complainant.

The disputed domain name <prejex.world> was registered on February 2, 2026. The Respondent states that Founded 2010 B.V. registered it on behalf of PHG.

According to an Internet Archive screenshot produced by the Complainant, as of June 12, 2026, the disputed domain name <prejex.world> resolved to a website similar to the “official” website at the disputed domain name <prejex.global>, mentioned above.

By July 15, 2026, <prejex.global> resolved to a placeholder page.

The Respondent states that, on unspecified dates, on the instructions of PHG, the Respondent took over from Founded 2010 B.V. as registrant of both disputed domain names.

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 names.

In its original Complaint, the Complainant portrayed the Respondent as an unconnected third party which, around the time that the Complainant began taking steps to enforce pledges granted to secure its loans in January 2026, appropriated the PREJEX online presence: registering the disputed domain name

² See <https://web.archive.org/web/20240414173045/https://www.prejex.global/>

³ The Panel has done so in accordance with its power to undertake limited factual research into matters of public record (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8).

⁴ See <https://web.archive.org/web/20240224062021/https://www.prejex.global/team/>

<prejex.world> on February 2, 2026, acquiring <prejex.com> in around May 2026, as allegedly indicated by a Whois update, and which allegedly occurred after the Respondent had taken control of the disputed domain name <prejex.global>, which the PREJEX Group had formerly used for its official website but since “lost”. The original Complaint further alleged that the Respondent used <prejex.world> to impersonate the Complainant by substantially copying the former PREJEX website at <prejex.global>, while <prejex.global> resolved to a passive holding page, and that <prejex.com> had redirected to that same page since July 2025. The Complainant says that this coordinated conduct was intended to appropriate the Complainant’s PREJEX identity and rights, and therefore established the Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests and its registration and use of all three domain names in bad faith.

Following Registrar verification, which disclosed that <prejex.com> was registered to “M S, Prejex” with an address in Germany, the Complainant withdrew this domain name from its Complaint and filed an amended Complaint concerning the disputed domain names <prejex.global> and <prejex.world> only.

In its amended Complaint, the Complainant maintains that there is “no relationship or economic link” between the Complainant and the Respondent, and that neither Topor Beheer B.V. nor Mr. Bijl has any independent right or legitimate interest in PREJEX. The Complainant contends that <prejex.world> is being used fraudulently to impersonate the Complainant by reproducing the former PREJEX website and the Complainant’s PREJEX branding, products and intellectual property, while <prejex.global> is being passively held in bad faith. The Complainant says that the Respondent’s control of both disputed domain names, its alleged concealment behind privacy services, the distinctive nature of PREJEX and the Respondent’s use of <prejex.world> demonstrate that the disputed domain names were registered and used to appropriate the Complainant’s PREJEX identity and rights.

B. Respondent

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

Notably, the Respondent contends that:

- against PHG’s long-term use of the disputed domain names, the actions of the Complainant, who had or has no involvement in PHG, should be regarded as bad faith;
- notwithstanding the Complainant’s personal trade mark registrations, which were obtained “behind the back” of PHG, the Complainant has not personally acquired any goodwill in the PREJEX mark, which remains with PHG;
- PHG did not transfer any rights to the Complainant or the Luxembourg Companies;
- the Complainant has tried to obtain the PREJEX and associated rights illegally;
- PHG is involved in proceedings to contest the Complainant’s “false pretences” and so the Complainant cannot rely on the trade marks;
- the Respondent can obtain further information from Mr. Stuut if required by the Panel;
- Founded 2010 B.V., not the Complainant, developed and owns the website;
- it is unclear why the Complainant has withdrawn its claim regarding <prejex.com>, which is registered by Mr. Stuut of PHG, if the Complainant maintains that it owns the PREJEX mark;
- the Respondent does not lack rights or legitimate interests, nor did it act in bad faith, as it was simply acting on behalf of PHG;
- bad faith must be assessed against the background that the underlying ownership of rights in PREJEX is itself in dispute;
- with regard to the website at <prejex.world>, the key issue is not whether the website contains visual or product-related elements associated with PREJEX, but the Complainant’s failure to demonstrate personal rights in those elements and, accordingly, the website cannot properly be characterised as use in bad faith towards the Complainant;
- even if the Complainant does hold the design registrations in a personal capacity, that would not prove bad faith registration of the disputed domain name <prejex.world>, which was previously registered on behalf of PHG and used for a website in the course of PHG’s ongoing business activities;

- the “renewed use” of the disputed domain name <prejex.world> was not a deliberate attempt to exploit any alleged rights of the Complainant, as this simply involved an operational change to an existing domain name to enable its use for email, arising from difficulties in using the disputed domain name <prejex.global> for this purpose; and
- the fact that the disputed domain name <prejex.global> is not currently in active use does not make it a passive holding in bad faith as it was registered for the established business of PHG.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Supplemental Filing

As mentioned in section 3 above, the Respondent has made an unsolicited supplemental filing containing additional evidence alluded to in the Response but unable to be retrieved withing the Response deadline.

Paragraph 10(d) of the Rules gives the panel authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence. Paragraph 10(c) requires the Panel to conduct the proceedings with due expedition.

UDRP panels have repeatedly affirmed that the party submitting an unsolicited supplemental filing should clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response, e.g., owing to some “exceptional” circumstance. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.6.

In this case, the Panel has decided to admit the filing to the extent that it contains additional factual material that the Panel wishes to take into account when considering the complicated factual background to this case.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. For reasons explained under the third element below, the Panel proceeds on the basis that the Complainant is the legitimate owner of the marks, notwithstanding that the Respondent has challenged the legitimacy of its acquisition thereof.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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

It is unnecessary for the Panel to consider this element in light of the Panel’s conclusions under the third element below.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel first observes that neither Party has clearly explained the factual backdrop to this case. The Panel has done its best to piece together the relevant facts from the information and evidence provided by the Parties (including the Complainant’s original Complaint which contained important details omitted from

the amended Complaint), as well as from the public record, principally the Internet Archive and the relevant intellectual property registers. The results of the Panel's efforts are set out in section 4 above.

The key facts are as follows.

The PREJEX Group includes (a) the Luxembourg Companies, of which the Complainant is director and on which the Complainant focuses, and (b) PHG, the focus of the Response.

PHG originally owned the PREJEX Registered Trade Marks relied upon by the Complainant. The Complainant has provided documentation indicating that, in December 2024, they were transferred from PHG to one of the Luxembourg Companies and that, following a loan/pledge arrangement between this company and the Complainant in November 2025, the PREJEX Registered Trade Marks ended up in the hands of the Complainant personally. For its part, the Respondent claims that all of this was done illegally, and "behind the back" of PHG, and that it is engaged in proceedings to contest the transactions. The Respondent provides no additional details regarding the dispute, and the Complainant does not mention it at all.

The Panel is not in a position to make any finding regarding the legality of the transfers of the PREJEX Registered Trade Marks on the basis of the current record and, for the purposes of this proceeding, it proceeds on the basis that the Complainant, as the current registered proprietor, is the legitimate owner of those marks.

Turning to the disputed domain names, as explained in section 5.A above, the Complainant originally maintained that the disputed domain names, and the domain name <prejex.com>, had all somehow come under the ownership and control of an unconnected third party at or around the time that the Complainant sought to enforce its pledges in January 2026. After Registrar disclosure revealed that the domain name <prejex.com> was registered to "MS" (potentially Maarten Stuut) of "Prejex", with an address in Germany, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint removing <prejex.com> from the proceedings. As mentioned in section 4, Maarten Stuut was named as "CEO" on the website at the disputed domain name <prejex.global> in April 2024, and is also the person allegedly giving instructions to the Respondent on behalf of PHG.

However, the amended Complaint still proceeds on the basis that the disputed domain names <prejex.global> and <prejex.world> are owned by an unconnected third party, apparently now suggesting that they were acquired by that party on the original registration dates (March 2022 and February 2026 respectively). Certainly, the Complainant does not specifically contend for later acquisition dates.

Whereas the Respondent asserts that the disputed domain names have at all times been ultimately owned and operated by PHG.

If the Complainant is correct that an unrelated third party acquired the disputed domain names and used them to impersonate the PREJEX Group, then, as the current owner of the PREJEX Registered Trade Marks, it is likely to prevail under the third element.

If, however, the Respondent is correct that PHG has at all times been the ultimate owner of the disputed domain names, the Complainant is likely to fail under the third element because, then, both disputed domain names would have been registered by an entity that was not only legitimately trading under the PREJEX mark, but which itself owned the PREJEX Registered Trade Marks at the time of registration of the first disputed domain name, <prejex.global>, on March 10, 2022. In any case, the Complainant's case appears to rest entirely on the disputed domain names being under independent ownership.

Accordingly, there is effectively one issue for the Panel to consider, namely whether or not the Complainant has established that the disputed domain names are indeed independently owned.

It is unfortunate that the Respondent did not see fit to produce any document signed by PHG to confirm the Respondent's assertion that it acts as PHG's agent. Nonetheless, the Panel is satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, the disputed domain names have at all material times been registered and held on behalf of PHG and in connection with the pre-existing PREJEX business, rather than independently by the Respondent for the purpose alleged by the Complainant.

First, the Complainant's position regarding <prejex.com> is difficult to reconcile with its case concerning the disputed domain name <prejex.global>. In the original Complaint, the Complainant relied strongly on the redirection of <prejex.com> to the disputed domain name <prejex.global> as evidence that these two domain names were under common control, while alleging that <prejex.com> had been acquired by the supposed bad actor in around May 2026. However, the Complainant's own evidence shows that the redirect was already in place by July 2025, long before the alleged 2026 appropriation. Furthermore, following Registrar disclosure that <prejex.com> was registered to "MS, Prejex" at an address in Germany, the Complainant withdrew that domain name from the proceeding but did not explain why the disputed domain name <prejex.global>, which it had previously insisted was under common control with <prejex.com>, should nevertheless be regarded as independently owned by an unrelated third party.

Second, the Complainant now simply maintains that the disputed domain name <prejex.global> is a passive holding in bad faith whereas, in the original Complaint, the Complainant had claimed that it had previously been used for the PREJEX Group's official website. Indeed, this is confirmed by the "Team" page on that former website as of February 24, 2024 (see section 4 above) in which the Complainant is named as the "COO". Yet the amended Complaint makes no mention of the previous official website.

Third, Chester Jansen of Founded 2010 B.V., who is also named on that "Team" page, has stated that he registered the disputed domain name <prejex.global> in 2022 at the explicit request of PHG, and he has produced an invoice from "mijndomein" for the disputed domain name <prejex.global> dated March 10, 2022, addressed to "Founded 2010 B.V. / C Jansen", as well as annual renewal invoices for each year since, most recently February 2026. Furthermore, Chester Jansen has confirmed that "a few months ago" Founded 2010 B.V. transferred the disputed domain name <prejex.global> to "Topor" (i.e., the Respondent) at the specific request of PHG. These circumstances strongly indicate that the disputed domain name <prejex.global> was registered for, and remains under the control of, PHG.

Fourth, the November 2025 pledge agreement between the Complainant and Prejex Holding S.A. included the disputed domain name <prejex.global> and the domain name <prejex.com>. While inclusion in the pledge agreement does not itself establish ownership, the Complainant's own original reliance on the agreement is at least consistent with both domain names then forming part of the existing PREJEX business rather than being controlled by an unrelated third party. The Complainant did not annex this document to the amended Complaint.

Fifth, the Respondent's account regarding the disputed domain name <prejex.world> is consistent with the surrounding evidence. Its use for a website materially the same as the former official PREJEX website at the disputed domain name <prejex.global>, together with the other evidence regarding its connection with the disputed domain name <prejex.global>, supports the Respondent's assertion that it too was registered on behalf of PHG rather than by an independent third party seeking to target the Complainant.

Accordingly, for all of the above reasons, the evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain names was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trade mark.

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

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Presiding Panelist

/William Lobelson/

William Lobelson

Panelist

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Panelist

Date: September 29, 2026