ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Lewis Silkin LLP v. Dynadot Privacy Service, Dynadot, LLC
Case No. D2026-3584

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lewis Silkin LLP, United Kingdom, internally represented.

The Respondent is Dynadot Privacy Service, Dynadot, LLC, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <payequityiq.com> (the "Domain Name") is 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 August 12, 2026. On August 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 14, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 24, 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 28, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 August 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 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

Under the trademark PAY EQUITY IQ, the Complainant offers goods and services relating to, inter alia, downloadable software and AI software in the field of employee compensation and workforce remuneration, business data analysis and human resource consulting services, educational services including webinars and training in the field of law, software as a service and platform as a service for employee compensation and workforce remuneration, and legal information and consultation services.

The Complainant holds United Kingdom registered trademark numbers UK00004363546 for PAY EQUITY IQ and UK00004363549 for PAY EQUITY IQ BY LEWIS SILKIN, both filed March 27, 2026 and registered on June 19, 2026. The Complaint also has pending European Union ("EU") trademark applications numbers 019338770 for PAY EQUITY IQ and 019338896 for PAY EQUITY IQ BY LEWIS SILKIN, both filed March 27, 2026, and registered on August 14, 2026.

The Domain Name was registered on March 27, 2026. The Domain Name does not resolve to an active webpage.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registration and applications for PAY EQUITY IQ and argues that the Respondent's Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark, as the Domain Name reproduces the mark in its entirety, differing only in the removal of spaces between the words and the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD").

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 the Domain Name. The term "Pay Equity IQ" is a coined and invented expression developed by the Complainant. It has no independent meaning or significance outside of the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent is not using the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of any website, content, or commercial activity associated with the Domain Name at any point since its registration on March 27, 2026.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent knew of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Domain Name was registered on the very same day as the Complainant's trademark applications. The Respondent could not plausibly have arrived at this precise combination of words on the same day as the Complainant's trademark filings by coincidence. The Complainant argues that the Respondent's registration was prompted by the Complainant's trademark filings, not by any independent interest in the term. The Respondent's use of a privacy/proxy service reinforces the inference of bad faith in the circumstances. The non-use of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

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 documented registered trademarks and applications. The Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark PAY EQUITY IQ. For the purpose of assessing the identity or confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel ignores the gTLD. 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 the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Furthermore, the Panel finds that the nature of the Domain Name, which is identical to the Complainant's trademark PAY EQUITY IQ, carries a high risk of implied affiliation. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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 trademark PAY EQUITY IQ and registered the same day as the Complainant's EU trademark applications, makes it clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The non-use of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding, see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. The Complainant's trademark is reasonable distinctive, the Respondent has failed to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the Respondent's appears to conceal its identity through a privacy service. Finally, the Panel cannot see any plausible good faith use to which the Domain Name may be put into use by the Respondent in light of the composition of the Domain Name.

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 the Domain Name <payequityiq.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/
Mathias Lilleengen
Sole Panelist
Date: September 30, 2026