ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. v. 倩楠 赵
Case No. D2026-3828

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

The Respondent is 倩楠 赵, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ieee.onl> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 26, 2026. On August 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 30, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Services, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 31, 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 September 9, 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 September 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on October 12, 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 a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of New Jersey, United States, which operates a professional organization for electrical engineering, electronics engineering and related disciplines.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE
IEEE (stylized mark)	United States	3666752	August 11, 2009
IEEE	United States	1770511	May 11, 1993

The Complainant holds the domain name <ieee.org> which hosts its main website.

The Respondent did not file a Response. Therefore, not much is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 10, 2026.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website purporting to offer online gambling services.

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 as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the IEEE trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the mere substitution of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent's use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. Rather, the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to mislead Internet users who are looking for the Complainant's genuine engineering, educational and professional services and divert them to its online gambling website.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because the Respondent had or must have had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark IEEE at the time it registered the disputed domain name, considering that the Complainant is the world's largest technical professional organization dedicated to advancing technology, with millions of members and readers worldwide. Additionally, the

disputed domain name is flagged and blocked by Symantec Endpoint Protection identifying the site as malicious, which further corroborates that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is deceptive and made in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
(ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Panel finds 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 gTLD ".onl" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). 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 for a complainant to prove 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.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name itself suggests a connection or implied affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent, which in fact does not exist. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1. The Panel notes that there is no apparent connection between the term "ieee", which comprises the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and the online gambling services offered at the disputed domain name. Such circumstances, particularly where the disputed domain name comprises an acronym, would call for an explanation from the Respondent. However, as discussed above, the Respondent has not provided any explanation or evidence. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.10.2.

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. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant's trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the Complainant is one of the world's leading professional organizations in the fields of electrical and electronics engineering, it is unlikely that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its well-known trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The composition of the disputed domain name would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it is not. Internet users who are looking for the Complainant's genuine engineering, educational and professional services may be diverted to the Respondent's online gambling website. The Respondent has offered no alternate explanation for its registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel, therefore, holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its web site, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its web site in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv). The fact that the disputed domain name is flagged and blocked by Symantec Endpoint Protection identifying the site as malicious is a further indication that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is deceptive and made in bad faith.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <ieee.onl> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/
Andrea Mondini
Sole Panelist
Date: October 26, 2026