ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
UAB “Planner5D” v. John Deecon, TrafficDomains INC
Case No. D2026-4009

1. The Parties

The Complainant is UAB “Planner5D”, Lithuania, represented internally.

The Respondent is John Deecon, TrafficDomains INC, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <planner5d.click> and <planner5d.world> are registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 7, 2026. On September 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 8, 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 (Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 17, 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 18, 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a Lithuanian company that operates an online 2D/3D home and interior-design platform under the PLANNER 5D mark. Its platform has more than 100 million users worldwide. The Complainant was listed as a Bronze Stevie winner for its AI-powered interior-design application in the Most Innovative Use of Mobile Technology category at the International Business Awards 2025.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for PLANNER 5D in the international classes 9 and 42, including the following:

- the European Union trademark registration No. 017137043 for PLANNER 5D (figurative), registered on December 7, 2017;

- the United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00917137043 for PLANNER 5D (figurative), registered on December 7, 2017; and

- the International trademark registration No. 1646478 for PLANNER 5D (figurative), registered on December 9, 2021.

The Complainant promotes and markets its products and services under the trademark PLANNER 5D through its primary website at the domain name <planner5d.com>, registered in 2010.

The disputed domain names were registered on October 6, 2025, and resolved to websites displaying the PLANNER 5D mark, and offering similar services to those offered by the Complainant, namely 5D home design services with AI-powered design tools. One of the websites indicates a physical address located at the same address as that of the Complainant. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names do not resolve to any active website. It appears from the evidence filed by the Complainant that the websites were taken down after the Complainant had contacted the Registrar.

The Respondent appears to be located in Malaysia (although the Panel notes that the Registrar provided information indicates an address Poznan, which is a city in Poland).

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that each disputed domain name reproduces the dominant textual component of the Complainant's trademark PLANNER 5D in its entirety, omitting only the space that cannot appear in a domain name. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".world", respectively ".click" is standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the first-element comparison. Therefore, the Complainant concludes that the disputed domain names are identical or, at minimum, confusingly similar to the Complainant's PLANNER 5D marks.

As regards the second element of the Policy, the Complainant submits that it has never authorized, licensed, sponsored, endorsed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register either disputed domain name, use the PLANNER 5D marks or company identity, reproduce PLANNER 5D content, or offer services or collect information in the Complainant's name. Further, the Complainant claims that before notice of the dispute, neither disputed domain name was used for a bona fide offering. Instead, the websites at the disputed domain names impersonated the Complainant. As such, the website at the disputed domain name <planner5d.world> advertised the Complainant's home design tools and features, reproduced the Complainant's history, mission, user-base claims and executive information, invited users to "Start Designing Free", claimed PLANNER 5D copyright, solicited names, email addresses and messages, and displayed purported contact details. The website at the disputed domain name <planner5d.click> identified its operator as UAB Planner5D, reproduced the Complainant's Vilnius address and genuine support channels, offered support in the Complainant's name, and published privacy and terms pages purporting to govern PLANNER 5D services, accounts, payments, data processing, and intellectual property. The Complainant concludes that such use is neither legitimate noncommercial use nor fair use. An identical domain carries a high risk of implied affiliation, and use for impersonation or passing off cannot confer rights or legitimate interests.

With respect to the third element of the Policy, the Complainant argues that bad-faith registration is evident from deliberate targeting. When the disputed domain names were registered in October 2025, the Complainant's registered rights, official website at domain name <planner5d.com>, and international business had existed for years. The disputed domain names consist solely of the Complainant's distinctive mark plus gTLDs. The websites copied detailed facts, identity, contact channels, legal texts, and service descriptions of the Complainant. This knowledge and copying exclude coincidence and show that the Respondent selected both disputed domain names because of the Complainant and its goodwill. Further, bad-faith use is established under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent used the disputed domain names intentionally to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The websites at the disputed domain names presented themselves as official PLANNER 5D resources, promoted the same type of home-design service, used commercial calls to action, solicited user details and messages, and diverted traffic intended for the Complainant.

The Complainant sent cease-and-desist letters concerning the disputed domain names on August 6, 2026, requiring cessation and transfer, and the disputed domain names were subsequently suspended. The Complainant claims that the deactivation of the websites at the disputed domain names does not cure bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Likewise, paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, provides that "the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence".

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names, and (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3.

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 names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark PLANNER 5D for the purposes of the Policy, based on the trademark registrations cited under section 4 above. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

It is the settled view of panels applying the Policy that the gTLDs (here ".world" and ".click") should be disregarded under the first element test.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's PLANNER 5D mark or variations thereof. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

According to the case file, the disputed domain names were used in connection to websites preeminently displaying the Complainant's PLANNER 5D trademark, and offering similar services to those offered by the Complainant, namely 5D home design services with AI-powered design tools. There was no disclaimer of non-affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant. Rather, the websites at the disputed domain names included sections with presentation of the entity offering the services claiming to be "Planner 5D", founded in 2011, which coincides with the year when the Complainant indicates to have started its activity.

Such use creates a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant and does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for passing off, or other deceptive conduct, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1). Furthermore, the address of the Respondent provided to the Registrar includes the name of a city in Poland but indicates Malaysia, while the physical address indicated on the website at one disputed domain name is in the United States and on the other website is the same as the address of the Complainant. Such discrepancies do not support in the Panel's view a claim of legitimate business.

Moreover, the disputed domain names, being identical to the Complainant's trademark, are inherently misleading. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

Under the above circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

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.

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.

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 the complainant. The Panel considers that this is the case here. The disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant's mark (apart from the figurative element that cannot be reflected in a domain name), and according to the record they were registered years after the first trademark registration of the Complainant. Moreover, the Respondent used the disputed domain names to host websites preeminently displaying the Complainant's PLANNER 5D trademark, and offering similar services to those offered by the Complainant, namely 5D home design services with AI-powered design tools, which clearly indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain names and was trying to pass itself off as being connected with the Complainant or as being the Complainant.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for passing off, or other deceptive conduct, constitutes evidence of bad faith under the Policy (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4). In the circumstances of this case, particularly the identity of the disputed domain names with the Complainant's trademark and its main domain name <planner5d.com>, the Respondent's lack of any rights or legitimate interests and its redirection of the disputed domain names to websites preeminently displaying the Complainant's PLANNER 5D trademark, and offering similar services to those offered by the Complainant, namely 5D home design services with AI-powered design tools without displaying a disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent, on balance of probabilities, intentionally attempted to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's PLANNER 5D trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. Such conduct constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Also, there appears to be a pattern of abusive registrations by the Respondent, as the Respondent was involved in other previous UDRP proceeding where similar facts caused the concerned UDRP panels to decide in favor of the relevant complainant (See *e.g. Caisse Fédérale de Crédit Mutuel v. John Deecon, TrafficDomains Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3021; *Carrefour SA v. John Deecon*, *TrafficDomains INC*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1511).[1] This fact also supports a finding grounded on paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy, referring to a respondent registering "the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct".

The fact that the disputed domain names no longer resolve to an active website does not change the above findings in the circumstances of the case. Panels have found that the nonuse of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the long use and distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the previous use of the disputed domain names made by the Respondent and its failure to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <planner5d.click> and <planner5d.world> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/
Mihaela Maravela
Sole Panelist
Date: November 4, 2026

[1] As part of a panel's general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has undertaken limited factual research into matters of public record, namely whether the Respondent was involved in prior UDRP cases, as the Panel considered such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision.