ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Inspectly ApS v. Gaurav Bagul, PraisElite Technologies Pvt. Ltd
Case No. D2026-3969

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Inspectly ApS, Denmark, represented by Otello Law Firm, Denmark.

The Respondent is Gaurav Bagul, PraisElite Technologies Pvt. Ltd, India, represented by RDB Associates, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <inspectly360.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 4, 2026. On September 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 4, 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 (Agnotic Technologies Private Limited) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 7, 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 12, 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 September 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on October 7, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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 Danish software company established in 2011 that develops digital tools for the construction and building industry, providing a platform that helps construction companies manage quality control and documentation, on-site inspections and checklists, defect tracking and reporting, and communication between office and construction site staff.

The Complainant's website at <inspectly.com/en/om-inspectly> states: "A large part of the construction industry will likely recognize iKontrol, which we started out in 2014. In November 2021, we decided to change our name to Inspectly with a mission to spread the high quality that our digital tools support beyond Denmark's borders. Besides a new name and logo, we are exactly as you know us."

The Complainant owns a portfolio of trademark registrations for INSPECTLY, including EU Trademark no. 018480538 that was filed on May 28, 2021, and that registered on September 29, 2021.

The Respondent is an individual with a company in India. According to the Respondent, the Respondent's company and Agnotic Technologies Private Limited (a software development company incorporated under the laws of India) are related companies within the same group, sharing common directors, and according to the Respondent, the disputed domain name is held by the Respondent for the group.

According to the Respondent, "Inspectly360" is a product owned and operated by Agnotic Technologies Private Limited, and is a facilities management automation platform that replaces the paper registers and spreadsheets that facility teams complete each day to run and maintain buildings that are already in use. Its workflows are washroom and housekeeping cleaning logs, pantry checklists, daily facility rounds, fire safety and security checks, planned preventive maintenance of equipment, and asset tracking, with reporting and dashboards across multiple sites. Its users are facility managers and operations teams at corporate offices, hospitals, hotels and retail premises.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 26, 2026. According to the Respondent, the Respondent's "Inspectly360" platform was launched in March 2026. The Respondent deliberately advances no figure for the number of customers of its "Inspectly360" platform in this proceeding.

On June 8, 2026, the website at the disputed domain name advertised the Respondent's software product "Inspectly360". The title of this website was "Inspectly360 | AI Inspection Software for Field Teams". The website included quotes from TrustPilot reviews, and a statement "4.5/5 Trustpilot Based on 3,987 reviews". The website included a copyright notice stating "© 2026 Inspectly360. All rights reserved."

On June 9, 2026, the Complainant's lawyers wrote to "Inspectly360.com" at the email address used on the website at the disputed domain name.

On June 18, 2026, lawyers for Agnotic Technologies Private Limited ("Agnotic") responded, denying the Complainant's assertions. On a "without prejudice" and "no admissions" basis, Agnotic offered to cease using "Inspectly360" and transition to an alternative brand within 10 to 12 months. Alternatively, Agnotic offered to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant at fair market value that represents the investment made by Agnotic. The amount of USD 130,000 is mentioned in the letter as the investment made by Agnotic associated with the disputed domain name.

On July 28, 2026, the Complainant's lawyers responded, rejecting both of these offers, and stating: "In the mutual interest of reaching an amicable resolution, our client is however – without prejudice – prepared to accept that your client transitions to an alternative brand identity within a period of 30 days."

At the present time, the disputed domain name diverts to a website at <inspectwrk.com> which has the title "AI Inspection Software for Field Teams | InspectWrk". This website ("the InspectWrk Website") advertises a product that appears to be similar to the product that was advertised at the disputed domain name on June 8, 2026 ("the Inspectly360 Website") discussed above. For example, the first text paragraph of both websites includes the sentence "From finding to fix, nothing slips through." The Inspectly360 Website includes quotes from TrustPilot reviews from two named customers. The InspectWrk website (at <inspectwrk.com/pricing>), under statements asserting a 4.5/5 TrustPilot rating and 3,987 reviews, includes reviews from the same two named customers with similar wording, but with references to "Inspectly360" removed.

The InspectWrk Website does not identify the owner or operator of this website, and the legal terms and privacy statement do not include any reference to a legal entity. The InspectWrk Website includes references to the European GDPR, and includes a clause in the privacy policy directed at "EU/EEA/UK residents". The privacy policy and terms of service have statements saying that they were last updated in March 2025.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for the cancellation of the disputed domain name.

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive INSPECTLY trademark in its entirety. The nature of the use of the disputed domain name in respect of software servicing similar customers to the Complainant's customers further reinforces the apparent connection between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's business and services.

The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the INSPECTLY trademark or to register or use the disputed domain name. The Respondent continued to use the disputed domain name after the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent.

The Complainant's trademark is distinctive and predates the registration of the disputed domain name. Given the nature of the trademark and the circumstances surrounding the registration and use of the disputed domain name, it is highly unlikely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name independently or by coincidence. Rather, the circumstances indicate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be cancelled.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the second and third elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

In summary, the Respondent makes the following submissions.

The Respondent does not compete with the Complainant.

The Respondent accepts that both the Complainant's product and the Respondent's product may be described at a high level of generality as "inspection" software, but that is the extent of the overlap.

The Complaint identifies no instance of actual confusion. None has occurred.

The Complainant has no registered trademarks in India where the Respondent is located.

The Respondent's logo is different to the Complainant's logo.

Before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, there has been use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

"Inspectly" is a suggestive term formed from the ordinary English verb "inspect", applied to inspection software. It is not an invented word, and it is not inherently distinctive for the goods and services for which it is registered in classes 9 and 42. The disputed domain name is genuinely used in connection with the relied-upon dictionary meaning and not to trade off third-party trademark rights.

The Complainant cannot establish bad faith as at February 26, 2026, because the Respondent was then unaware of the Complainant and of its mark. No circumstance is identified and no evidence is adduced of the Respondent's knowledge or awareness of the Complainant or its mark.

None of the circumstances in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy is made out.

The Respondent requests a finding of reverse domain name hijacking.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

(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.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “360”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark 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

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 Respondent relies upon paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy and states that this paragraph is satisfied here, because, before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, there has been use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

For the reasons discussed below in relation to the third element of the Policy, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name was not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel also notes that, at the present time, the Respondent appears to have ceased use of the “Inspectly360” branding.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Respondent asserts that there was no bad faith registration because when the disputed domain name was registered in February 2026, the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant or its mark. The Respondent states that knowledge could not be inferred, because there is no evidence of the Complainant’s reputation in India or elsewhere, and “Inspectly” is not inherently distinctive for inspection software.

The Complainant's correspondence to the Respondent refers the Respondent to the Complainant's website, that states that the Complainant has more than 800 users of its "Inspectly" product and lists the names of some customers.

The Respondent asserts an international reputation. The website at <agnotic.com/about> appears to the Panel to be the Respondent's website and/or the Agnotic Technologies website. It states: "Formerly known as PraisElite Technologies Pvt. Ltd. Agnotic Technologies Pvt. Ltd", and includes an address in the same city in India as included in the Response. This website states "Agnotic's engineering hub is in Pune, India, and we have a team in Austin, Texas" and lists offices in India, the United States, Canada, and London. The website includes photographs of personnel speaking at London Tech Week. The InspectWrk website (to which the disputed domain name currently diverts) refers to the European GDPR and to "EU/EEA/UK residents".

The Panel considers that the Respondent is a sophisticated modern software development group with international operations, and that the Respondent developed and marketed software in the same general field as the Complainant. The Complainant's INSPECTLY trademark is somewhat distinctive. The Panel concludes that it is likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant at the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, and did so because of the Complainant's corporate name and trademark.

Based on the review of the evidence before the Panel, the Panel considers that the following is a probable factual situation. The Respondent established a product called InspectWrk, and according to the InspectWrk Website, this was in existence in March 2025. In about February 2026, the Respondent created a clone product of the InspectWrk product and website, and launched it at the disputed domain name under the "Inspectly360" branding in March 2026 to acquire new users for what is in fact the InspectWrk product. Shortly after the Complaint was filed, the Respondent diverted the disputed domain name to the original InspectWrk Website.

Panels have found that redirecting a domain name to a different respondent-owned website is evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy applies, namely that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its InspectWrk Website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. This is evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel also expresses concern that supposed reviews that appeared on the InspectWrk Website also appeared on the Inspectly360 Website. It is highly unlikely that two customers would give the same review to both the Inspectly360 product and the InspectWrk product, unless it was in fact the same product. In the Panel's opinion, this is evidence of an attempt by the Respondent to create and play off of confusion between the InspectWrk brand and the Complainant's "Inspectly" brand. The Panel visited the TrustPilot review website and could not find any listings or reviews for the InspectWrk product or the Inspectly360 product, or for the Respondent or for Agnotic Technologies. This is surprising, because both the Inspectly360 Website and the InspectWrk Website refer to 3,987 reviews. Moreover, the Inspectly360 Website and the InspectWrk Website do not refer to the Respondent or Agnotic Technologies (or any other legal entity). Together, these facts strongly suggest that the website at the disputed domain name is misleading and possibly fraudulent. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

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 <inspectly360.com> be cancelled.

/John Swinson/
John Swinson
Sole Panelist
Date: October 30, 2026