ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Panolocal GmbH & Co. KG v. John Bubalo, Localpano Inc., and Localpano LLC
Case No. D2026-3770

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Panolocal GmbH & Co. KG, Germany, represented by LHR Rechtsanwälte - Lampmann Haberkamm Rosenbaum & Partner mbB, Germany.

The Respondents are John Bubalo, Localpano Inc. (the "First Respondent"), United States of America ("United States"), and Localpano LLC (the "Second Respondent"), United States, represented by Chyrkin Law, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <localpano.com>, <localpano.net>, <localpanopro.com>, <localpanoramic.com>, and <panoslocal.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 24, 2026. On August 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 26, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (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 27, 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 September 1, 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 First Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2026. On September 28, 2026, the Second

Respondent requested the automatic four-day extension under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules and an additional extension under paragraph 5(e), until October 13, 2026, to submit the Response. On the same date, the Complainant objected to an additional extension under paragraph 5(e) of the Rules. On September 28, 2026, the Center granted the automatic four-calendar-day extension for response under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, with a due date of October 3, 2026. On the same date, the Center granted an additional extension until October 5, 2026. On October 5, 2026, the Second Respondent filed the Response.

On October 6, 2026, the Complainant submitted a notification of a related court proceeding. On the same date, the Second Respondent filed a response to the Complainant's notification of a related court proceeding. On October 7, 2026, the Complainant filed a supplemental submission. On October 8, 2026, the Second Respondent submitted a communication regarding the Complainant's supplemental submission.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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.

On October 21, 2026, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1, whereby it admitted the Complainant's supplemental submission of October 7, 2026 and provided an opportunity to the Respondent to submit a reply to it. On October 26, 2026, the Respondent filed its reply to the Complainant's supplemental submission. On October 29, 2026, the Complainant submitted a communication to the Center regarding the judgment in the court proceeding, and on October 30, 2026, the Second Respondent submitted a reply to it.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a certified Google Street View agency and digital service provider, established in Germany in 2017. It operates its official website at the domain names <panolocal.com>, registered on May 7, 2019, and <panolocal.de>, registered on May 8, 2019. The earliest Wayback Machine record[1] of the Complainant's website is dated August 18, 2019. [2]

The Complainant is the owner of the German trademark PANOLOCAL with registration No. 302019217438, registered on June 21, 2019 for services in International Classes 35, 38, 40, 41 and 42 (the "PANOLOCAL trademark").

The Registrar has confirmed that the First Respondent is the registrant of the disputed domain names.

The First Respondent, John Bubalo, is a private person who is identified in the Registrar's verification reply as the CEO of the company Localpano Inc., which is indicated as the "Registrant Organization" in respect of four of the disputed domain names. Localpano Inc. was dissolved on October 10, 2025.

A Response has been filed in this proceeding by the Second Respondent, Localpano LLC, which maintains that it is the proper respondent in this proceeding, because on September 20, 2025, Localpano Inc. had assigned to it the entire Localpano business, including four of the disputed domain names, and the fifth disputed domain name <localpano.net> was nominally registered in the name of John Bubalo due to an administrative error.

The details about the dates of registration of the disputed domain names and their use are the following:

---

[1] Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.8.

[2] https://web.archive.org/web/20190818145446/https://panolocal.de/

Disputed domain name	Date of registration	Use at the time of filing of the Complaint	Current use
<localpano.com>	January 3, 2024	Resolved to a commercial website offering virtual tours / panoramic photography services under the brand LOCALPANO	Resolves to a commercial website offering virtual tours / panoramic photography services under the brand LOCALPANO
<localpanopro.com>	March 12, 2025	Redirected to the disputed domain name <localpano.com>	Inactive
<localpanoramic.com>	March 12, 2025	Redirected to the disputed domain name <localpano.com>	Redirects to the disputed domain name <localpano.com>
<panoslocal.com>	June 20, 2025	Inactive	Redirects to the disputed domain name <localpano.com>
<localpano.net>	October 31, 2025	Redirected to the disputed domain name <localpano.com>	Redirects to the disputed domain name <localpano.com>

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its PANOLOCAL trademark. It notes that the disputed domain names <localpano.com>, <localpano.net>, <localpanopro.com>, and <localpanoramic.com> incorporate the identical word elements "local" and "pano" as the PANOLOCAL trademark, only reversing their order. The disputed domain name <localpanopro.com> incorporates also the additional term "pro", and the disputed domain name <localpanoramic.com> also incorporates the additional letters "ramic". According to the Complainant, the reversal of the word elements "local" and "pano" in these disputed domain names does not distinguish them from the PANOLOCAL trademark, which remains recognisable.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name <panoslocal.com> closely reproduces the Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark, with the insertion of the letter "s" between the elements "pano" and "local", and the PANOLOCAL trademark is easily recognisable within this disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, because the Complainant has not authorised it to use the PANOLOCAL trademark or to register any domain name incorporating or imitating it.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent's use of the corporate name "Localpano Inc." does not establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, because this entity was incorporated on May 8, 2024, more than four months after the registration of the first disputed domain name <localpano.com> on January 3, 2024. The Complainant submits that such subsequently acquired corporate identity cannot retroactively legitimise the prior registration of this disputed domain name. The Complainant further notes that Localpano Inc. was dissolved on October 10, 2025 and no longer has an active corporate status.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, because the website at the disputed domain name <localpano.com> offers virtual 360° tours and panoramic photography services, which are identical to the services covered by the Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark, and are offered under a name that reproduces the distinctive elements of the Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark in reverse order. The Complainant adds that the Respondent's services specifically target the German speaking market through a dedicated German language website section and a Berlin-registered entity tasked with serving that market, and Germany is where the Complainant holds its trademark rights and has operated since 2019. According to the Complainant, the Respondent's offering cannot be characterised as an independent business coincidentally using similar terms in an unrelated market, but as an offering targeting the Complainant's own market under a confusingly similar name. The Complainant adds that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, given the commercial nature of the website to which they resolve or redirect.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Complainant notes that its trademark rights significantly predate their registrations. According to the Complainant, the registration of the disputed domain names cannot reasonably be regarded as coincidental. Rather, by systematically registering multiple domain names reproducing, reversing or closely modifying the distinctive elements "pano" and "local", the Respondent has deliberately targeted the Complainant's prior trademark. The Complainant submits that the direct link between the disclosed Respondent and the operation of the disputed domain name <localpano.com> is further confirmed by the Respondent's disclosed email address, […]@localpano.com, and the Respondent is not a passive or unrelated domain holder but is directly responsible for the operation and infrastructure of the website to which the disputed domain names resolve or redirect, reinforcing the conclusion that their registration and use are elements of a single, coordinated scheme.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain names <localpano.net>, <localpanopro.com>, and <localpanoramic.com> are also being used in bad faith, because they redirect Internet users to the disputed domain name <localpano.com> where competing commercial services are promoted for the German market by the entities Localpano LLC, United States, and xlume Media UG (haftungsbeschränkt), Germany.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and diverts Internet users to the same commercial website for commercial gain.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name <panoslocal.com> is currently offline, but it reproduces the Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark almost entirely and forms part of a pattern of multiple confusingly similar domain name registrations, several of which are actively used to redirect Internet users to the same competing commercial website. According to the Complainant, the passive holding of the disputed domain name <panoslocal.com> by the same registrant who actively operates the competing commercial website under the other four disputed domain names cannot reasonably be regarded as an isolated or coincidental registration, but forms part of the same deliberate scheme targeting the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant notes in its supplemental submission that the Response meets the Complaint with a newly developed factual account: that LOCALPANO arose independently as a United States business, that the disputed domain names remained within that same business despite the succession from Localpano Inc. to Localpano LLC, and that the original registration dates therefore remain controlling.

The Complainant notes that the Registrar's records identify Mr. Bubalo as registrant of all five disputed domain names and Localpano Inc. as "registrant organization" for four of them. The Response accepts that those records remain unchanged. The Complainant adds that the Response asserts that four disputed domain names were assigned to Localpano LLC on September 20, 2025, and that Localpano LLC thereafter continued the Localpano business. The Response further states that the disputed domain name <localpano.net> was registered on October 31, 2025 – three weeks after Localpano Inc. had been dissolved "through the existing LOCALPANO account".

The Complainant points out that the Second Respondent's own account therefore leaves unresolved who controlled that registrar account following the alleged assignment and in what capacity the disputed domain name <localpano.net> was subsequently registered in the name of a dissolved company. The Complainant notes that the official records for Localpano LLC do not identify Mr. Bubalo as a member or manager, and the Response does not otherwise identify the LLC's ownership or explain Mr. Bubalo's relationship to it. The Complainant states that it nevertheless does not object to Localpano LLC participating as a respondent, together with Mr. Bubalo and Localpano Inc. According to the Complainant, such procedural treatment, however, does not mean that the disputed domain names remained under continuous ownership or control for purposes of determining their relevant registration date.

The Complainant notes that the Second Respondent relies on the original registration dates on the premise that the alleged assignment represented merely the continuation of the same Localpano business, rather than an acquisition by an unrelated party. According to the Complainant, the evidence however does not establish such continuity, as no document identifies Mr. Bubalo as an owner or controller of Localpano LLC, and the assignment was signed on behalf of Localpano LLC by another person. The Complainant also points out that more than a year after the alleged assignment, the Registrar's records continue to identify Mr. Bubalo and Localpano Inc. as the registrant.

The Complainant adds that the subsequent registration of the disputed domain name <localpano.net> further illustrates the evidentiary gap. On October 31, 2025, after both the alleged assignment and the dissolution of Localpano Inc., the disputed domain name <localpano.net> was registered in its name.

According to the Complainant, the Second Respondent's evidence does not establish that the LOCALPANO designation was adopted independently of the Complainant's trademark, and the Second Respondent's reliance on a bona fide offering is undermined by the disputed domain name <panoslocal.com>. The Complainant disputes the Second Respondent's explanation that the disputed domain name <panoslocal.com> is part of a "defensive pattern of registering brand variants of one's own primary domain", and points out that it does not reflect the Second Respondent's asserted LOCALPANO name, but instead reproduces the elements of the Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark in the same order, with the addition of one letter, and redirects visitors to the Second Respondent's website at the disputed domain name <localpano.com>.

The Complainant notes that although the Response portrays Localpano as an independently developed United States business without any material connection to Germany, the Second Respondent's own evidence shows substantial links between Localpano and the German speaking market. The website at the disputed domain name <localpano.com> identifies the German entity xlume Media UG specifically as the contact for the "DACH Region", before the contact given for the European Union and North America; the Response states that xlume Media UG was incorporated in Berlin in December 2024; and a German language version of the website at the disputed domain name <localpano.com> existed by August 5, 2025 at the latest. The Second Respondent claims to have acquired four of the disputed domain names on September 20, 2025, and the disputed domain name <localpano.net> was registered on October 31, 2025. The Complainant notes that both of those dates fall after the incorporation of the Berlin contact entity and after the German language website was in place. According to the Complainant, the September and October 2025 acquisition and registration must be assessed against these circumstances. By then, the Second Respondent was offering the same specialised services as the Complainant and was specifically addressing the market in which the Complainant had long operated under its registered PANOLOCAL trademark.

The Complainant notes that the Response also submits the result of its own trademark search for "pano local", which returns the Complainant's PANOLOCAL registration as its first result.

The Complainant objects to the Second Respondent's request to the Panel to deny the Complaint on the ground that the same dispute would be determined by the Regional Court of Stuttgart, Germany. According to the Complainant, the two proceedings differ materially in parties, issues, domain names and relief. The

Complainant's application against the Second Respondent was withdrawn, and the court's order of September 14, 2026 summoned to the oral hearing only the Complainant, xlume Media UG and its manager personally. The Complainant adds that the First Respondent has not been summoned as a party before the Stuttgart court, while xlume Media UG and its manager are not respondents in the present proceeding. The Complainant further notes that the subject matter is not coextensive, as <panoslocal.com> is before the Panel but not the Stuttgart court, while the Stuttgart proceedings concern an additional .nl domain name that is not before the Panel. The Complainant also points out that the legal questions are different, as the court is asked whether specified use of LOCALPANO in Germany infringes the Complainant's German trademark and whether xlume Media UG and its manager are liable for that conduct, and the court would not determine whether the registrants have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names or whether they were registered and used in bad faith. In contrast, the present proceeding will not determine trademark infringement or the personal liability of xlume Media UG or its manager. Finally, the requested relief is fundamentally different, as the court is asked to grant provisional injunctive relief against specified use in Germany, and not transfer or cancellation of any disputed domain name.

The Complainant adds that its amended Complaint preceded the court application, so there was no court proceeding to disclose under paragraph 3(b)(xi) of the Rules when this Complaint was filed. The Complainant requests that the Panel exercise its discretion under paragraph 18(a) of the Rules and proceed to a decision on the merits, without prejudice to any court proceedings under paragraph 4(k) of the Policy.

With its communication of October 29, 2026, the Complainant informed the Center that the Regional Court of Stuttgart had granted its application for interim relief in part, finding a likelihood of confusion between PANOLOCAL and Localpano and ordering xlume Media UG and its manager to refrain from using the Localpano sign and logo for the relevant services in Germany. The Complainant notes that the Court dismissed the separate application concerning the domain names because xlume Media UG's control over them was not sufficiently established, and that the judgment is not yet final.

B. Respondent

The First Respondent has not participated in this proceeding and has not filed a Response.

The Second Respondent filed a Response and requests to be recognised as Respondent and that its Response be admitted in the proceeding and taken into account.

The Second Respondent notes that John Bubalo and the dissolved Localpano Inc. are named as Respondent, based on the Registrar's disclosure, but neither of them is the real party in interest. The Second Respondent explains that Mr. Bubalo started the LOCALPANO business in January 2024 and ran it through Localpano Inc. from its incorporation in May 2024. By a written Asset and Intellectual Property Assignment Agreement dated September 20, 2025, Localpano Inc. assigned to Localpano LLC the entire Localpano business, including the disputed domain names <localpano.com>, <localpanopro.com>, <localpanoramic.com>, and <panoslocal.com>, together with the Localpano name, logo, website, business records and goodwill. The Second Respondent notes that Localpano Inc. was dissolved 20 days later, on October 10, 2025, but the registrant contact details for the disputed domain names were never updated. The fifth disputed domain name, <localpano.net>, was registered on October 31, 2025, after the assignment, for the same continuing business. The Second Respondent notes that Registrar's records for the disputed domain name <localpano.net> nonetheless show Mr. Bubalo and Localpano Inc. as registrant. According to the Second Respondent, this may be an administrative error, and this disputed domain name appears to have been registered through the existing Localpano account, whose contact details had not been updated after Localpano Inc. was dissolved. The Second Respondent states that it holds the disputed domain names, operates the websites at the disputed domain names, and, unlike the dissolved Localpano Inc., is a company in active good standing.

The Second Respondent does not dispute that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark.

The Second Respondent maintains that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. It submits that long before any notice of this dispute, the disputed domain name <localpano.com> was the home of a real, paying photography business. The Second Respondent states that that business, with its name and goodwill, is what Localpano LLC acquired and continues.

The Second Respondent states that it is commonly known as Localpano and that the business has been known as "Localpano" since 2024, independently of the disputed domain name <localpano.com> to its clients, to Google, which credits its published tours to "localpano", and in the names of both Localpano Inc. and Localpano LLC.

The Second Respondent states that the disputed domain names consist of descriptive terms used for what they describe. The Second Respondent notes that "pano" is a generic abbreviation for "panoramic," and "local" is an ordinary dictionary word. The Second Respondent states that it uses the disputed domain names for exactly what those words describe: a bona fide offering of local panoramic and 360° photography services, which is a legitimate interest independent of the Complainant's German trademark.

The Second Respondent states that the Complainant's own PANOLOCAL trademark combines two such descriptive terms; it is not coined or fanciful. According to the Second Respondent, registering a descriptive term does not confer a monopoly over it in combination with other words and PANOLOCAL does not give the Complainant the right to exclude every "pano"/"local" combination used for what those words describe. The Second Respondent adds that other businesses offering panoramic and virtual-tour photography have for years built their names from "pano" and an ordinary word.

The Second Respondent adds that the Complainant relies on a single German national trademark, claims no trademark rights in the United States, and offers no evidence of any use or reputation of PANOLOCAL outside Germany, Austria and Switzerland, and the Second Respondent's use of descriptive terms for a United States photography business is not affected by that unrelated trademark. The Complaint's reliance on the German language section of the website does not change this, because that section was a later addition, and the earliest German language page captured by the Wayback Machine is dated August 5, 2025, 19 months after the disputed domain name <localpano.com> was registered. The Second Respondent points out that, whether that later expansion infringes the Complainant's German trademark is a question of German trademark law, which the Complainant has itself placed before a German court.

According to the Second Respondent, registration in bad faith is assessed as of the date of registration, and the assignment does not restart that clock, but instead documents an unbroken chain of possession. The Second Respondent states that the assignment agreement states that Localpano LLC "replaces the transferor and continues the business of LOCALPANO" and that the transfer "is part of the continuation/reorganization of LOCALPANO's existing business, rather than an acquisition of LOCALPANO's domain names as unrelated, standalone investments in domain names". The business, its name, logo, website, and services have remained the same. According to the Second Respondent, the relevant date for the disputed domain name <localpano.com> is therefore January 3, 2024. Even if the Panel were to take September 20, 2025 as the relevant date, the result would be the same, as on that date Localpano LLC acquired an established business that had traded under the LOCALPANO name for more than a year and a half, together with the disputed domain names carrying that name. According to the Second Respondent, taking over a going concern's own brand is not the targeting of a third party's mark.

The Second Respondent notes that Mr. Bubalo registered the disputed domain name <localpano.com> for the LOCALPANO business months before xlume Media UG was founded on December 18, 2024, and that nothing connected the Localpano business to Germany, or to the Complainant, at the time. The Second Respondent points out that the Complaint offers no evidence of any use or reputation of the PANOLOCAL trademark outside Germany, Austria and Switzerland. According to the Second Respondent, nothing suggests a United States-based registrant of a domain name built from two descriptive English words could have known of this foreign-language trademark.

The Second Respondent notes that the remaining four disputed domain names were registered later, when the Localpano business had already been trading under its own name for more than a year, and that they extend the Respondent's own Localpano brand, and that three of them were registered before any German language page of the website at the disputed domain name <localpano.com> appeared in the Wayback Machine. According to the Second Respondent, this later timing does not show that the First Respondent knew of, or targeted, the Complainant's Germany-only trademark, for which the record shows no United States presence. The Second Respondent points out that none of the four disputed domain names have independent use, and they all redirect to the disputed domain name <localpano.com>, Localpano's own website, which trades under its own name and logo and makes no reference to the Complainant. The Second Respondent maintains that that is ordinary protection of one's own brand, not an attempt to trade on someone else's.

With its submission pursuant to Procedural Order No. 1, the Second Respondent made the following additional statements:

According to the Second Respondent, the assignment shows why Localpano LLC holds four of the disputed domain names and that the Localpano business passed as a whole from Localpano Inc. to Localpano LLC, including the disputed domain names, together with the Localpano name, logo, website, business records and goodwill, and the parties recorded that the transfer "is part of the continuation/reorganization of the existing LOCALPANO business and not the acquisition of the LOCALPANO domain names as unrelated standalone domain-name investments".

The Second Respondent notes that panels look to substance, not to registrar formalities, and where a respondent shows "an unbroken chain of possession", panels "typically would not treat merely formal changes or updates to registrant contact information as a new registration"; a business that passes as a going concern, together with its own domain names, is not an acquisition of domain names from a third party, and what matters is that the domain names went with the business, not who owns the company that took it over.

The Second Respondent adds that on September 20, 2025, Localpano LLC took over a business that had been started under the LOCALPANO name in January 2024, with documented paid work from July 2024, under its own name and logo. Taking over an established business together with its brand is not the targeting of someone else's mark.

The Second Respondent notes the Complainant's acceptance that Localpano was trading by July 2024. According to the Second Respondent, this goes to the heart of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, which asks whether the Respondent used the disputed domain name <localpano.com> in connection with a bona fide offering of services before any notice of the dispute. The Second Respondent states that notice came in August 2026 at the earliest, while the use began two years earlier and continues today.

The Second Respondent states that "LOCALPANO" is "local" plus "pano", the standard abbreviation of "panoramic", adopted by a Chicago business that makes panoramic tours of local businesses, and notes that the Complainant itself told the German court that "panoramic" is "merely the spelled-out form of the element 'pano'" and "conveys the same meaning". Where a complainant's mark is a combination of two common terms and the combination is descriptive or suggestive of its business, the mark owner bears a heavier burden to establish that use of a similar phrase by another is illegitimate or in bad faith.

The Second Respondent adds that the disputed domain name <panoslocal.com> was registered in June 2025, before any German language page of the associated website at <localpano.com> appeared in the Wayback Machine. It combines "panos", the plural of "pano", with "local", and it leads only to the Localpano website, which trades under its own name and logo and makes no reference to the Complainant. A redirect to the Second Respondent's own business is not evidence that the Second Respondent knew of the Complainant's mark, and, beyond the resemblance of the name itself, the Complainant's supplemental submission offers no evidence. According to the Second Respondent, whatever view the Panel takes on the

disputed domain name <panoslocal.com>, this cannot carry over to the other four disputed domain names that reproduce the Respondent's own trading name.

The Second Respondent submits that the Complainant's supplemental submission only offers inferences drawn from later events - a Berlin contact for the "DACH Region" in the website Imprint, the incorporation of xlume Media UG in December 2024, and a German language page by August 2025. Each of these came 11 months or more after the disputed domain name <localpano.com> was registered on January 3, 2024. At most, this shows that a United States business later offered its services in German speaking countries, but offering services in a market is not knowledge of a particular competitor's national trademark. These events do not turn the September 2025 takeover into a new registration in bad faith, as by then Localpano was an established business with its own customers, and a business that carries on under its own name in a new market is not targeting a competitor's mark.

The Second Respondent states that the Complainant started the German court proceeding the day after the Center notified this Complaint, and told the Center nothing until the day after the Respondent had disclosed it, 26 days later. The Respondent maintains its request that the Panel take that conduct into account.

With its communication of October 30, 2026, the Second Respondent states that the German Court judgment is a preliminary injunction judgment, reached "only on a summary basis" and not "under the strict requirements of proceedings on the merits", that is not final and the claim would be finally decided only in main proceedings, that it binds only xlume Media UG and its manager, and not the Second Respondent, and only within Germany. The Second Respondent adds that the German Court dismissed the claim directed at four of the five disputed domain names, because xlume Media UG was not shown to have "the actual ability or authority to decide on the use and management of the domains".

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issues

A. Identity of the Respondent

The Complaint was filed against John Bubalo, Localpano Inc., referred to in the present decision as the First Respondent. According to the information provided by the Registrar, this person and entity are identified as the registrants of the disputed domain names <localpano.com>, <localpanopro.com>, <localpanoramic.com>, and <panoslocal.com>, while John Bubalo is the registrant of the disputed domain name <localpano.net> with no information on registrant organization. The evidence in the case shows that Localpano Inc. was dissolved on October 10, 2025, but it is unclear what happened to any remaining assets of this corporation after its dissolution. The Center sent the notification of the proceeding to the First Respondent using the contact details provided by the Registrar. The First Respondent, however, did not file a Response or otherwise participate in the proceeding.

A different party, Localpano LLC, referred to in the present decision as the Second Respondent, intervened in the proceeding. It claims to be the proper respondent, and filed a Response. The Second Respondent submits that it has acquired the business of Localpano Inc., including the disputed domain names <localpano.com>, <localpanopro.com>, <localpanoramic.com>, and <panoslocal.com>, pursuant to an assignment agreement entered into with Localpano Inc. on September 20, 2025.

The Complainant does not object to the admission of the Second Respondent as a respondent in this proceeding and to the admission of its Response for consideration by the Panel.

As further discussed below in the present decision, the evidence in the case shows that the Second Respondent controls all of the disputed domain names in connection with its website at "www.localpano.com".

In these circumstances, the Panel finds it justified and appropriate to admit the Second Respondent as respondent in this proceeding and to admit its Response and further submissions.

Therefore, pursuant to paragraph 10(a) and (b) of the Rules, the Panel admits the Second Respondent as respondent in this proceeding together with the First Respondent, and admits the Second Respondent's Response and further submissions. The First Respondent remains a respondent in this proceeding.

For ease of reference, the Panel refers to the First and Second Respondents collectively as the "Respondent" where appropriate. Where the Panel's findings concern the conduct of only one of them, the Panel refers specifically to the First Respondent or the Second Respondent, as applicable.

B. German Court Proceeding

The Complainant notified the Center that on September 10, 2026, it had commenced legal proceedings relating to the disputed domain names before Landgericht Stuttgart (the Regional Court of Stuttgart), Chamber for Commercial Matters, case number: 36 O 34/26 KfH (the "German Court proceeding"). The proceeding was initiated on the basis of the Complainant's application for a preliminary injunction under German trademark law, based on the PANOLOCAL trademark, against Localpano LLC, xlume Media UG (haftungsbeschränkt), and its manager. The relief sought by the Complainant in the German court injunction proceeding includes the prohibition of the use, in the course of trade within Germany, of the sign "Localpano" and of the disputed domain names <localpano.com>, <localpano.net>, <localpanopro.com>, <localpanoramic.com> and a .nl domain name for offering 360° Google Street View tours and panoramic photography services. The Complainant notes that the relief sought in the German Court proceeding does not include an order requiring the transfer or cancellation of any of the disputed domain names. The Complainant notes that its application against Localpano LLC was withdrawn on September 14, 2026, and the current respondents in the German court proceeding are only xlume Media UG (haftungsbeschränkt) and its manager. The Complainant adds that an oral hearing was held on October 1, 2026.

With its communication of October 29, 2026, the Complainant states that the German Court rendered its judgment on October 22, 2026, that the Court granted the Complainant's application for interim relief in part, ordering xlume Media UG and its manager to refrain from using the sign "Localpano" and the LOCALPANO logo in the course of trade in Germany for services involving the creation of virtual 360° Google Street View tours and panoramic photography for businesses, as offered at "www.localpano.com". The Court judgment also found that the website at "www.localpano.com" is directed at customers in Germany, including through its German-language content and the identification of xlume Media UG as the contact for the German-speaking market, that the Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark has average distinctiveness, that there is a likelihood of confusion, given the similarity between "panolocal" and "localpano" and the identity of the services, and that xlume Media UG is not merely a contact point but actively participates in Germany in the provision of the services offered on "www.localpano.com". The Court dismissed the separate application concerning the disputed domain names, as it did not consider that the control of xlume Media UG over them was sufficiently established. The Complainant adds that the judgment is not yet final and remains subject to the applicable remedies.

The Complainant notes that the Complaint was submitted on August 24, 2026, and the amended Complaint on September 1, 2026, and points out that they both preceded the application to the German Court, which was filed on September 10, 2026. The Complainant adds that when the Complaint and the amended Complaint were submitted, no other legal proceeding relating to the disputed domain names existed that could have been identified under the Rules. The Complainant notes that the Second Respondent has been aware of the German Court proceedings and has itself addressed them in its Response and placed the German Court file before the Panel, so it has not been prejudiced by the timing of this notification.

According to the Second Respondent, the present dispute exceeds the scope of the Policy and should be left to the German Court that the Complainant has already seized. The Respondent submits that this dispute turns on contested questions: the scope of a descriptive term, competing evidence of prior use, corporate succession among three entities, and the weight of a narrow foreign trademark against a United States-

based business, which are not well suited to a summary written-submissions proceeding. The Second Respondent states that the Complainant's grievance is a claim of German trademark infringement, and the Complainant has chosen a German court to resolve it. Notably, the injunction it seeks is confined to use "in the course of trade within the Federal Republic of Germany"; it does not ask the court to transfer or cancel any domain name, or to restrain use of the disputed domain names outside Germany. In the Second Respondent's view, a transfer under the Policy would give the Complainant, worldwide, more than it has asked its own national court to grant.

The Second Respondent states that in this case it is the Complainant who has taken the dispute to court, after filing this Complaint and on the same issues; a complainant that elects to litigate its trademark claim before a national court should not also obtain a parallel UDRP ruling on the same claim. The Second Respondent adds that the central contested facts, namely who controls the disputed domain names and who is their true operator, turn on credibility and documentary disclosure that only a court can test. The Second Respondent notes that the Complaint was submitted on August 24, 2026 and amended on September 1, 2026; the Center notified it on September 9, 2026; and on September 10, 2026, the Complainant applied to the German Court, but the Complainant did not notify the Center of that proceeding. The Second Respondent asks the Panel to take the Complainant's non-compliance with paragraph 18(b) of the Rules into account. The Second Respondent states that it does not seek a suspension, and that the appropriate course is to deny the Complaint on the narrow ground that the dispute exceeds the scope of the Policy and should be determined by the German Court that the Complainant has already seized.

The Panel considers that there is no basis to suspend or terminate the present proceeding on the basis of the German Court proceeding. There are several reasons for this conclusion - the parties to the two proceedings are different, their subject matter is different, and the relief sought is also different. The First and the Second Respondents are not parties to the German court proceeding, its subject matter is trademark infringement, and the relief sought there is a preliminary injunction ordering the prohibition of the use, in the course of trade within Germany, of the sign "Localpano" and of the disputed domain names <localpano.com>, <localpano.net>, <localpanopro.com>, and <localpanoramic.com> for offering 360° Google Street View tours and panoramic photography services. None of these matters is to be decided in the present proceeding, which is confined to the three elements under the Policy, and the relief sought here is the transfer of the disputed domain names, whereas no transfer or cancellation of any of the disputed domain names is sought in the German Court proceeding. The outcome of the present proceeding does not depend on the outcome of the German Court proceeding, and it is not necessary to require the Complainant to submit a certified English translation of the documents for the German Court proceeding as the parties are not in dispute as to which entities are parties to it, what its subject matter is, and what relief is sought there.

The Panel takes into account that the Complainant informed the Center about the German Court proceeding after the filing of the Response. While the Second Respondent objects to the timing of the notification, it is evident from the Response that the Second Respondent was informed of the German Court proceeding by xlume Media UG and had the respective documents at its disposal before the filing of the Response.

Therefore, pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 18 of the Rules, the Panel takes note of the existence of the German Court proceeding and proceeds to the issuance of the present decision.

C. Supplemental Submissions

The Complainant filed an unsolicited supplemental submission on October 7, 2026, and requests its admission in the proceeding. In support of this request, the Complainant points out that the Response disclosed for the first time the alleged assignment of four disputed domain names from Localpano Inc. to Localpano LLC, the alleged continuation of the Localpano business through that entity, and the continued administration of the disputed domain names through the existing registrar account. The Complainant also notes the Second Respondent's requests in relation to the German court proceeding, which was commenced after the filing of the amended Complaint.

As noted in section 4.6 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel. In all such cases, panels have repeatedly affirmed that the party submitting or requesting to submit 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 unforeseen or exceptional circumstance).

The Panel considers that the reasons advanced by the Complainant justify the admission of its supplemental submission, so the Panel admitted this submission and provided an opportunity to the Respondents to comment on it through Procedural Order No. 1. The First Respondent did not submit any comments, while the Second Respondent was allowed to file a Reply to the Complainant's supplemental submission, which it did, and the Panel will take its Reply into account in deciding the case. The Parties also sent further submissions on October 29 and 30, 2026, respectively, which the Panel has also taken into consideration in the spirit of paragraphs 10(a) and (b) of the Rules.

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the PANOLOCAL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the PANOLOCAL trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain names, albeit with the elements "pano" and "local" appearing in reverse order in four of the five disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the PANOLOCAL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other elements (here, "pro", "ramic" or "s") in some of the disputed domain names may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the PANOLOCAL trademark 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 and Registered and Used in Bad Faith

It is usual for panels under the Policy to consider the issues of rights or legitimate interests and registration and use in bad faith in turn. However, in this case it is more convenient to consider those issues together. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.15. The reason for this is that the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used with knowledge of its business and trademark and in order to take unfair advantage of the same. In contrast, the Second Respondent contends that the disputed domain names have been independently registered and used in good faith in relation to their dictionary meaning for a business that does not target the Complainant. If the Second Respondent's contentions are correct, at the very least the disputed domain names would not have been registered in bad faith. If, however, the Complainant's contentions are correct, the Respondents would have no relevant rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, which would have been both registered and used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

The First Respondent has not participated in this proceeding and has not submitted a Response, although it remains the officially-listed registrant of the disputed domain names. The First Respondent does not claim to have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, does not deny any of the contentions of the Complainant, and does not confirm or reject any of the statements of the Second Respondent.

The Second Respondent has submitted a Response and claims that it is the actual owner of the disputed domain names, that it is commonly known by a name that corresponds to the disputed domain names and that before notice of the dispute, it and its alleged predecessor in title, Localpano Inc., used them in connection with a bona fide offering of services that correspond to the dictionary meaning of the disputed domain names. The Second Respondent maintains that it became the owner of four of the disputed domain names by virtue of an assignment agreement, pursuant to which Localpano Inc. transferred to it the existing Localpano business on September 20, 2025. As to the fifth disputed domain name, <localpano.net>, the Second Respondent claims that it was registered in the name of John Bubalo through the existing Localpano account due to a possible administrative error.

The Second Respondent has not submitted any evidence showing that the assignment of the disputed domain names has been formally recorded with the Registrar. All of the disputed domain names remain registered to the First Respondent and there is no evidence that either Respondent has notified the Registrar of the assignment or requested that the registration records be updated to identify the Second Respondent. Apart from the assignment agreement, which is further discussed below in this section, there is no convincing evidence showing the actual transfer of any other elements of Localpano Inc.'s United States business, such as clients, contracts, employees, receivables, liabilities, or other movable or immovable property.

As both Parties have referred to the Wayback Machine records for the disputed domain name <localpano.com>, the Panel has itself independently reviewed these records online. They present a picture that is quite different from the one described by the Second Respondent.

The Wayback Machine records show that the website at the disputed domain name <localpano.com> identified the Second Respondent as its service provider before the date of the assignment agreement with Localpano Inc. dated September 20, 2025.

The Wayback Machine records for January 21, 2025 [3] show that the associated website displayed a contact phone number in the United States and indicated prices in USD, while the records from January 25, 2025 [4] onwards show that the website no longer displayed this phone number and the currency of the indicated prices was changed to EUR.

The Wayback Machine records for July 11, 2025 [5] show an "Imprint" which identifies the Second Respondent as "Service provider" and indicates the entity xlume Media UG "For inquiries" in the "DACH Region". [6] The Second Respondent submits that xlume Media UG was established in Germany on December 18, 2024 (Section IV.(ii) of the Response). The records also show that a German version of the website existed at least since July 11, 2025. [7]

The Wayback Machine records for July 15, 2025 [8] show that the associated website displayed General Terms and Conditions of Business, Payment and Delivery ("GTC"), applicable to all business relationships between Localpano LLC as contractor and its clients (Article 1 of the GTC), which provided that "This contract and the privity of contract between the contractor and the contractual partner are subject to the laws

[3] https://web.archive.org/web/20250121191231/https://www.localpano.com/

[4] https://web.archive.org/web/20250125182520/https://www.localpano.com/

[5] https://web.archive.org/web/20250715224926/https://www.localpano.com/imprint/

[6] The DACH region refers to the three Central European countries of Germany (D), Austria (A), and Switzerland (CH).

[7] https://web.archive.org/web/20250711185053/https://www.localpano.com/

[8] https://web.archive.org/web/20250715233342/https://www.localpano.com/terms/

of the Federal Republic of Germany, excluding the provisions of international private law (conflict of laws) and the UN Sales Convention." The GTC also indicate prices in EUR and contain a link to "the contractor's privacy policy."

The Wayback Machine records for July 15, 2025 [9] show a Privacy Policy stated to be in force "As of 30. January 2025", which identifies as "Person responsible" the owner of the Second Respondent and contains numerous references to Germany, Switzerland, the GDPR, and specific provisions of German and Swiss law, without any reference to United States law.

The Wayback Machine records for the other disputed domain names show that they have redirected to the website at the disputed domain name <localpano.com>, which has also been confirmed by the Parties.

The above records support the conclusion that the Second Respondent was involved in the operation of the Localpano business months before the date of the assignment agreement. It is also evident from the records that a significant change occurred after January 21, 2025, when the associated website ceased to focus exclusively on the United States market and started targeting the markets of Germany, Switzerland, and the European Union. This is inferred from the indication of EUR as the currency, the application of German, Swiss and European Union law to the relations with customers, the indication of the German company xlume Media UG for inquiries in the DACH Region, and the absence of any evidence provided by the Second Respondent showing any continued activities in the United States after January 2025.

The exact date when this happened cannot be verified solely from the Wayback Machine records, as captures were made only on specific dates, and the fact that there is no record for a particular date does not mean that there was no website or that particular content was displayed on such date. The fact that, on January 25, 2025, the website started indicating prices in EUR and the contact phone number in the United States was removed, coupled with the fact that the Privacy Policy in force as of January 30, 2025, and still displayed on the website, indicates as "Person responsible" the owner of the Second Respondent and contains numerous references to Germany, Switzerland, the GDPR and specific provisions of German and Swiss law, without mentioning United States law, supports the conclusion that, by January 30, 2025, there had been a significant change in the operation and geographic orientation of the business conducted through the disputed domain name <localpano.com>, which by then was primarily targeting Germany, Switzerland, and the European Union. It is notable that the website has never displayed an announcement of the assignment of Localpano Inc.'s business to Localpano LLC or any instructions to remaining customers in the United States following such assignment, nor has it displayed any disclaimer regarding the absence of a relationship with the Complainant.

The fact that all other disputed domain names have redirected to the website at the disputed domain name <localpano.com> and have not been used for other purposes supports the conclusion that they have been under common control in connection with the Localpano business. The circumstances of this case support the conclusion that, by January 30, 2025, the individual who subsequently established and owned the Second Respondent had acquired beneficial control over the disputed domain name <localpano.com> and the business conducted through it. For the purposes of assessing the relevant acquisition date under the Policy, the Panel treats that individual and the Second Respondent as a single controlling interest.

All the above is not reflected in the provisions of the assignment agreement, which describe the sale of Localpano Inc.'s business on September 20, 2025. It is unclear what goodwill, brand reputation, customer loyalty, and ongoing earning power associated with an ongoing United States business remained to be transferred on September 20, 2025, given the evidence that control over the disputed domain names had already changed and the business conducted through <localpano.com> had been refocused on the German and Swiss markets months earlier. If a real transfer of the ongoing business of Localpano Inc. in the United States had taken place, the transfer of the various assets that comprised this business would have generated various documents, which should be readily available to both Respondents. As the Second

[9] https://web.archive.org/web/20250715230031/https://www.localpano.com/privacypolicy/

Respondent claims an unbroken chain of control over the disputed domain names, it should have understood that the Panel would need to see documents showing that an actual transfer of the United States business of Localpano Inc. had taken place, and not just the transfer of control over the disputed domain names.

No such documents have been presented to the Panel. There is no evidence that any actual business, clients, contracts, ongoing projects, receivables, or employees have been transferred to the Second Respondent. Even the registrant information for the transferred disputed domain names has never been updated. Although that omission is not conclusive, it is inconsistent with the asserted formal transfer of ownership and, when considered together with the absence of contemporaneous evidence of the transfer of clients, contracts, projects, receivables, employees, or other operational assets, further weakens the claim that an ongoing business was transferred.

Neither the First nor the Second Respondent has provided any explanation as to why they have never taken steps to register the transfer, nor have they disclosed which of them has continued to interact with the Registrar following the transfer and to pay the associated renewal fees. The differing registrant information for <localpano.net> is not readily explained by the asserted use of the same unchanged registrar account and casts further doubt on the administrative-error explanation. If the domain name had been registered automatically through an account containing the same registrant details as the other disputed domain names, one would ordinarily have expected the registrant organization to remain Localpano Inc. There is also no evidence that the alleged assignment agreement has been disclosed to any third party. A party acquiring a business would normally take care to inform relevant third parties of the transfer, particularly when it wishes to acquire the associated goodwill.

There is no dispute between the Parties that the German company xlume Media UG, registered in December 2024, is also involved in the Second Respondent's business. The Second Respondent does not explicitly explain its relationship with this company, but xlume Media UG is indicated on its website as the contact for inquiries in the DACH region, which the Panel understands to mean that this entity would be the one serving clients from this region, rather than the Second Respondent itself. The Panel notes that xlume Media UG has told the Complainant in writing that it is neither the holder nor the user of any of the disputed domain names, nor of the sign "Localpano" (section V. of the Response). The Second Respondent has not submitted any statement by xlume Media UG explaining its role in the business. However, since the Second Respondent's website appears to be targeting primarily the markets of Germany and Switzerland, and xlume Media UG is identified as the contact for the DACH region, the Panel finds that xlume Media UG is involved to some extent in the Second Respondent's business.

The website of xlume Media UG at the domain name <xlume-media.com> offers professional on-site photography for businesses, architecture, and branded spaces, as well as the production of virtual and 360° media and the editing and preparation of visual content for different platforms and applications. The Panel concludes from this information that xlume Media UG offers services identical or similar to those of the Complainant and is therefore one of its competitors in the German market. As such, xlume Media UG is likely to have been aware of the existence of the Complainant. Given its designation as the contact for the DACH region and its role in relation to the services offered through <localpano.com>, xlume Media UG appears to have performed an operational function in the Second Respondent's entry into the German market. The Panel therefore considers xlume Media UG's likely awareness of the Complainant to be relevant circumstantial evidence, although not, by itself, conclusive proof of the Second Respondent's knowledge.

The Second Respondent asks the Panel to apply the principle of "substance over form". Applying this principle, the Panel is not convinced that the alleged assignment agreement and the other evidence establish a transfer of an operating business accompanied by an unbroken chain of ownership or control over the disputed domain names. Although the agreement purports to transfer the Localpano business and its associated goodwill and assets, the record contains no contemporaneous evidence showing the implementation of those provisions beyond the asserted transfer of control over the disputed domain names and website. The Panel therefore finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the transaction involved a

substantive change in beneficial control over the disputed domain names and was not merely a formal reorganization within an established chain of ownership or control. There is no conclusive evidence as to why the registrant information remained unchanged. Whatever the reason, the resulting arrangement left the First Respondent as the registrant of record while the Second Respondent exercised beneficial control over the disputed domain names. This discrepancy complicates the Second Respondent's reliance on the assignment agreement as evidence of an unbroken chain of ownership or control.

It is therefore proper to treat the date on which the controlling interest behind the Second Respondent acquired beneficial control over the disputed domain name <localpano.com> as the date from which the Second Respondent's bona fides should be assessed. See section 3.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1. In the Panel's view, the circumstances of this case support the conclusion that such beneficial control over <localpano.com> had been acquired by January 30, 2025. The relevant dates for the other disputed domain names are their respective dates of registration. The Panel therefore assesses knowledge and targeting separately by reference to those dates, while also taking into account that all five disputed domain names were subsequently used as part of the same integrated commercial operation.

The Second Respondent does not state whether any research into the German market or potential competitors was conducted before control of the disputed domain name <localpano.com> was acquired and the associated website was redirected towards the German market. The Panel need not infer that any formal market research was undertaken. Rather, the Panel considers the totality of the circumstances. Considering that the Parties operate in the same industry and in similar markets, and that, by January 30, 2025, the Complainant had been operating under the PANOLOCAL trademark in the German market for at least five years, the Second Respondent is likely to have been aware of the Complainant and of the similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the Localpano brand. Taken separately, each of the words "local" and "pano" has an ordinary meaning in English, but their combination is not a dictionary word, particularly in the context of the German market, where the Parties compete with each other. The Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark had been validly registered in Germany and used since 2019, more than five years before the Second Respondent took control of the disputed domain name <localpano.com>. It is notable that after the Second Respondent took control of the disputed domain name <localpano.com>, four other disputed domain names were registered, in particular <panoslocal.com>, which is almost identical to the Complainant's trademark and domain name.

Considering all the above, the Panel concludes that it is more likely than not that the Second Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its PANOLOCAL trademark when it took control of the disputed domain name <localpano.com> in late January 2025, but nevertheless proceeded to make changes to the associated website that refocused it on the German market, acquire the other disputed domain names in the name of the First Respondent, and redirect them to the disputed domain name <localpano.com>. For the Panel, this means that the Second Respondent either turned a blind eye to the Complainant's rights and disregarded the risk of customer confusion and harm to a competitor, or acted with the intention of exploiting the goodwill of the Complainant by misleading and attracting Internet users to its own website, where it offers the same services in the same market in competition with the Complainant. Given the deliberate refocusing of <localpano.com> on the German market, the acquisition/registration of four additional disputed domain names after control of <localpano.com> had been acquired, the particular similarity of <panoslocal.com> to the Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark and domain name, and the redirection of those domain names to the same commercial website, the latter scenario appears more likely.

The Panel accepts that the record appears to demonstrate genuine commercial activity under the LOCALPANO name in the United States before notice of this dispute. The decisive question, however, is whether the Second Respondent's acquisition and subsequent use of the disputed domain names were bona fide. For the reasons set out above, the Panel finds that the Second Respondent acquired or registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and used them to target the same market under a confusingly similar designation. That subsequent conduct prevents the Second Respondent from relying on paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

By using the disputed domain names for the same commercial website offering services identical or closely similar to those of the Complainant in the same market, the Second Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's PANOLOCAL trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the services offered through it. These circumstances fall within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the second and the third elements of the Policy have been established.

C. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if, after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH") or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the Complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute RDNH. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.16.

The Second Respondent has requested that the Panel decide whether the Complainant filed the Complaint in bad faith.

Since the Complainant has established the three elements of the Policy and has prevailed in this proceeding, there is no basis for a finding of RDNH.

The Panel therefore denies the Second Respondent's request for a finding of RDNH against the Complainant.

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 names <localpano.com>, <localpano.net>, <localpanopro.com>, <localpanoramic.com>, and <panoslocal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/
Assen Alexiev
Sole Panelist
Date: November 11, 2026