

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chambers of David Quest KC and David Head KC,
3VB Services Limited v. Sam Monthier
Case No. D2026-3410

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Chambers of David Quest KC and David Head KC, 3VB Services Limited, United Kingdom (altogether the “Complainant”), represented by Northwall Cyber LLP, United Kingdom (or “UK”).

The Respondent is Sam Monthier, Mexico.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <3vb.org> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 4, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 4, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (User #de14377d Privacy / PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 5, 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 August 10, 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 August 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on September 8, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant offers legal services under the unregistered service marks 3VB and 3 VERULAM BUILDINGS from barristers' chambers at Three Verulam Buildings, Gray's Inn, London, United Kingdom.

The Complainant previously held UK trademark registration number UK00002269506 for 3VB (registered on October 5, 2001, but the registration is no longer in force). The Complaint is based on unregistered/common law rights, see below. The Complainant has registered the domain name <3vb.com> since 2001.

The Domain Name was registered on September 25, 2025. The Complainant documents that the Domain Name resolves to a website that passes off as the Complainant's website. On the webpage, the Respondent identifies itself as the Complainant and uses material from the Complainant's genuine webpage in a translated version.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of use of 3VB in connection with its offering of legal services, and argues that 3VB is not a dictionary word or a common abbreviation, but a coined identifier derived from the Complainant's address. The Complainant's use of 3VB dates back more than two decades, inter alia at the Complainant's official website. The Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's trademark identically, with the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".org".

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. The Respondent has not been commonly known by 3VB. The Respondent is not using the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. It uses the Complainant's name, reputation, real members, copied or translated profile materials and contact details to suggest affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent knew of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Respondent uses the Domain Name to attract users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant. The Complainant documents evidence of actual public targeting and confusion. The Respondent's use of a privacy/proxy service reinforces the inference of bad faith in the circumstances. The Complainant argues that the Respondent's conduct is not capable of any credible good-faith explanation.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown that its mark has become a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with the Complainant's services and thereby successfully asserted unregistered/common law trademark rights in the trademark 3VB. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. The Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's unregistered trademark. For the purpose of assessing the identity or confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel ignores the TLD. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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. While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Based on the record, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name is evidence of bad faith, see below. Furthermore, the Panel finds that the nature of the Domain Name, which is identical to the Complainant's trademark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The high risk of implied affiliation has also been evidenced in practice. Moreover, the use of the Domain Name cannot be considered fair as it falsely suggests affiliation.

Based on the available record, 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.

The fact that the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's unregistered trademark, and the use of the Domain Name, make it clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The use of the Domain Name, to impersonate the Complainant and attempt to defraud Internet users, is clear evidence of bad faith use. Under the circumstances, it also appears that the Respondent intentionally has employed a privacy service to hide its identity. It further underlines the Respondent's bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Name <3vb.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2026