

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

IRESS Limited v. Emir Hammani

Case No. D2026-3577

1. The Parties

The Complainant is IRESS Limited, Australia, represented by Mallesons Law firm, Australia.

The Respondent is Emir Hammani, United States of America (or “US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <iress.tech> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 12, 2026. On August 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 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 19, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 an Australian public company listed on the Australian Securities Exchange since April 12, 2000. The Complainant is a technology company providing software to the financial services industry across Asia-Pacific, North America, Africa, and the United Kingdom and Europe. The Complainant has over 1,100 employees and its software is used by thousands of financial services businesses globally, including financial advisers, wealth managers, investment managers, traders, lenders, and mortgage brokers. The Complainant has a market capitalization of approximately AUD 1.2 billion. The Complainant's predecessor was founded in 1993 and it began trading under and by reference to the IRESS brand in 2000. The Complainant has invested substantial resources in the creation, promotion and development of the IRESS brand. As a result of its use of the IRESS brand over decades, the IRESS brand has a substantial reputation in the markets in which it operates for its financial technology solutions, including its wide variety of financial services software and investment management platforms.

The Complainant owns numerous registrations for its IRESS trademark in various jurisdictions including for instance Australian trademark registration No. 847157, registered on August 21, 2000, and the US trademark registration No. 6533128, registered on October 26, 2021.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 22, 2026, and does not currently resolve to any active website. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected to the Complainant's official website at "www.iress.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 is identical to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name consists solely of the distinctive word "iress", which is the textual element of each of the Complainant's trademarks. It is well established that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") such as ".tech" is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name contains as its sole element the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to use its trademark in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant or its goods and services and is not connected to, affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant in any way. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any independent website or content. It merely operates an automated redirect to the Complainant's own official website, which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been making any bona fide noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the

Complainant where no such connection exists. The Complainant has not found any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that it has any registered trademarks, business names or other relevant rights in IRESS. The disputed domain name also deprives the Complainant of the ability to use and control a domain name identical to its own mark in the “.tech” gTLD space, while providing no legitimate service, information or commentary to Internet users.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. By registering the disputed domain name identical to the Complainant’s mark and retaining control over it (including the ability to redirect it to any destination at any time), the Respondent has created a real or implied ongoing threat to the Complainant. The Respondent used the disputed domain name to facilitate per se illegitimate activity (including by misleading visitors or creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark). The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant. The Respondent has also sought to take unfair advantage of, abuse, and/or otherwise engage in behavior detrimental to the Complainant’s trademark.

B. Respondent

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

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 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.

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.

The applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the Panel disregards the gTLD “.tech” for the purposes of the 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.

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.

The available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise agree with the use of its prior registered trademarks by the Respondent, thus no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could be reasonably claimed (see, e.g., *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#)).

The initial use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's official website does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use (see, e.g., *Allen & Overy LLP v. Can Kulah*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-1147](#)).

Noting the high risk of implied affiliation between the disputed domain name and the identical well-known trademark of the Complainant, the Panel finds that there is no plausible fair use to which the disputed domain name could be put that would not have the effect of being somehow connected to the Complainant (see, e.g., *Instagram, LLC v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Zayed*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2897](#)).

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name identical to the Complainant's widely-known trademark and made it to redirect to the official website of the Complainant, which confirms the Respondent knew and targeted the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name, which confirms the Respondent's bad faith.

The mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. The Panel is convinced that the Complainant's trademark is well established through long and widespread use and the Complainant has acquired a significant reputation and level of goodwill in its trademark both in Australia and internationally. Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name identical to the Complainant's trademark was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Although at the time of this decision the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage, its previous use and the lack of explanation of possible good faith use from the Respondent make any good faith use of the disputed domain name implausible. Thus, the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

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 <iress.tech> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2026