ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Pydantic Services Inc. v. Viktor Cherkasov
Case No. D2026-4056

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Pydantic Services Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Dorsey & Whitney, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Viktor Cherkasov, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pydantic.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 9, 2026. On September 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 11, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 15, 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 15, 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. On October 10, 2026, the Respondent requested the automatic four calendar day extension for response under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. The due date for Response was extended to October 15, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on October 15, 2026. The Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing to the Center on October 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on October 26, 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, a Delaware corporation incorporated on December 14, 2022, is behind the PYDANTIC open-source data validation library for the Python programming language and related software services, offered from its website at <pydantic.dev> (registered in April 2022). The PYDANTIC library was first released on GitHub in May 2017 by the Complainant's founder and chief executive officer, Samuel Colvin, and, according to third-party download statistics, had been downloaded some 34.6 million times by March 2021 when the disputed domain name was registered.

The Complainant's PYDANTIC trademark is the subject of numerous registrations, including International Trademark Registration No. 1703343 PYDANTIC (word) in classes 9, and 42, having a registration date of September 26, 2022, and designating Brazil, the European Union, India, Japan, the Russian Federation, and the United States of America, originally in the name of Mr. Colvin and since recorded in the Complainant's name.

The Respondent is an individual whose registration details give an address in Ukraine. He states that he has since relocated to Slovakia. [1]

The disputed domain name was registered on March 17, 2021. On July 28, 2024, Mr. Colvin, through the broker DomainAgents and without disclosing his identity, offered USD 20,000 for the disputed domain name, which the Respondent declined on or before July 30, 2024.

On July 29, 2024, the disputed domain name resolved to a blog on the Teletype platform entitled "PYDANTIC.COM" (username "@pydantic"), consisting of short posts of words and phrases in Slovak, Russian, German, and English. A pinned post dated August 25, 2024, states in Russian (as translated): "This is a personal blog about learning foreign languages. The idea was born on March 17, 2021, coinciding with the registration of the domain. Any resemblance in name or purpose is purely coincidental."

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 that PYDANTIC is a coined term, a portmanteau of "Python" and "pedantic" with no dictionary meaning, which it has used continuously since May 2017, and in which it had acquired unregistered rights and a considerable reputation by the time the disputed domain name was registered, as shown by download figures, GitHub sponsorship, industry attention, conference presentations, and social media following. The disputed domain name is identical to its mark, lay unused for over three years, and the blog was launched the day after the Complainant's purchase offer, making it a pretextual, after-the-event attempt to justify the registration, while the pinned disclaimer evidences awareness of the Complainant. Given the coined nature of the mark, the Respondent could only have registered the disputed domain name to target the Complainant.

---

[1] The Panel does not consider it necessary to discuss that the Registrar disclosed an address in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision, and whether there was any impact on the case notification noting the Respondent's relocation to Slovakia, and that the Respondent has participated actively in this proceeding.

In its Supplemental Filing, the Complainant further contends that the Respondent is a serial domain name registrant associated with several thousand domain names, has been a respondent in prior UDRP proceedings, and has a computer science background, such that he is unlikely to have been unaware of the PYDANTIC software; that the offer was made anonymously through a broker because the Respondent's contact details were concealed and to avoid an inflated counteroffer; that the Respondent could have registered other available domain names containing "pedantic"; and that the Complainant's date of incorporation is irrelevant because unregistered rights arise through use.

B. Respondent

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

Notably, the Respondent contends that the Complainant did not exist until December 2022 and that all of its trademarks postdate the registration of the disputed domain name; the Complaint falsely attributes use since 2017 to the Complainant, without explaining how any earlier user's rights passed to it. He registered the disputed domain name because it is the phonetic equivalent of the dictionary word "pedantic", <pedantic.com> being unavailable, for a personal language-learning blog, development of which was delayed by his family's relocation from Ukraine to Slovakia. He had never heard of the Complainant, whose reputation is at most confined to a niche software market. The blog has nothing to do with software, has no commercial element, and makes no reference to the Complainant. The broker's anonymous offer asserted no rights, so he had commenced using the disputed domain name before any notice of a dispute. The Respondent characterizes the Complaint as a "Plan B" filing following a failed attempt to purchase the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Procedural Issue – Supplemental Filing

The Complainant filed an unsolicited Supplemental Filing.

Paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules in effect grant the Panel sole discretion to determine the admissibility of unsolicited supplemental filings. Admissibility of supplemental filings is to be assessed based on relevance, foreseeability, the need to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, and the equal treatment of the parties so that each has a fair opportunity to present its case. Paragraphs 10(b) and (c) of the Rules; *Societé aux Loteries en Europe, SLE v. Take That Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2007-0214; WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.6.

The Supplemental Filing contained new evidence not addressed in the Complaint, specifically evidence showing that the Respondent owns or has owned thousands of domain names, that he has been involved in at least two prior disputes under the Policy, namely *Intel Corporation v. Viktor Cherkasov*, WIPO Case No. D2025-2845, and *Akuo Energy SAS v. Viktor Cherkasov*, WIPO Case No. D2018-1489. In the former the Respondent revealed that he is a professional in computer science and has a degree in that field. The Respondent lost that case, but won the latter case.

The Complainant justifies the introduction of this evidence by relying on the fact that the Respondent's identity was unmasked by the Center after the Complaint was filed. Although that is true, the Panel notes that the Respondent's identity was unmasked prior to the filing of the amendment to the Complaint, and it was open to the Complainant to introduce this evidence at that point and not in its later Supplemental Filing.

Nevertheless, the Respondent's background on computer science is information publicly available, and the Panel considers that this new evidence is highly relevant to the question of the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant's mark at the time he registered the disputed domain name. The Supplemental Filing was copied to the Respondent on October 20, 2026, and the Respondent has not sought to respond to it. In the

interests of justice, the Panel admits the Supplemental Filing to the extent that it addresses the new evidence described above.

To the extent that the rest of the Supplemental Filing involves argument surrounding issues already raised in the preceding pleadings, it is not admitted.

B. 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 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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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

C. 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 explains his registration of the disputed domain name by stating that "pydantic" is the phonetic equivalent of the English word "pedantic"; he sees himself as a pedantic person and values that approach for being clear without logical gaps; he says the word fits his ideas about education, mainly educating himself; and that the purpose of the disputed domain name was for a personal, noncommercial blog about his struggles with learning languages, which would also let him practise building websites.

As the Complainant pointed out, the Respondent only began using the disputed domain name for his blog the day after the Complainant's broker approached the Respondent. That timing is suggestive of the blog being an after-the-fact attempt at manufacturing a pretext of legitimate interest.

The Panel has independently[2] viewed the Respondent's blog posts and found that most of them lack substance and many of them appear random or meaningless. For instance, one post dated May 13, 2025, simply reads: "Who ?" in its entirety. There are many posts similar to that, and many that appear rambling and/or perfunctory. The blog posts therefore have the character of having been produced in a hurry, without

[2] In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.8.

much thought, purely with a view to getting something – anything – on the page. This again points to pretextual use.

Furthermore, for the reasons discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is more likely than not that the disputed domain name was registered to take advantage of the Complainant's rights. This cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. D2022-1981.

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

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

While no trademark registration had been granted at the date the disputed domain name was registered, it is clearly recognized in jurisprudence under the Policy that a registrant may be found to have acted in bad faith when taking unfair advantage of nascent trademark rights. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.8.2.

In this case, the Complainant's mark had been in use for approximately four years prior to registration of the disputed domain name. As found in *Intel Corporation v. Viktor Cherkasov*, WIPO Case No. D2025-2845, the Respondent is a computer science professional with a degree in that field. In that case, he was found to have targeted a mark also within that industry in bad faith by offering the disputed domain name for sale in circumstances where the domain name was identical to the mark. In the circumstances, the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's industry prior to registration of the disputed domain name, and the Complainant's software already enjoyed 34.6 million downloads by that point. This points towards knowledge and targeting by the Respondent.

That the Complainant was only incorporated in December 2022 does not assist the Respondent. The PYDANTIC mark had been used for the software by the Complainant's founder, Mr. Colvin, since May 2017, and the registrations originally held by him have since been recorded in the Complainant's name. The question is whether the Respondent targeted the mark and the reputation it had accrued, not the corporate vehicle through which it is now held.

The Respondent's explanation for why he chose a misspelling of "pedantic" is not convincing. He states: "If the panelist would like to transfer 'pedantic.com' to me, I would be very happy. But that domain name was not available to me in 2021 when I registered this domain name instead, since it was the best available match to a word which fits my ideas about education, and educating myself primarily." There would have been many other domain names available for registration containing the correct spelling of "pedantic" in combination with other terms. Additionally, the Respondent describes himself as a "pedantic person". The Panel considers that a pedant would not be satisfied with a misspelling of a word.

The Panel has independently viewed the Internet Archive records for the disputed domain name. Screenshots from 2021 – 2022 show that the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page with an "Inquire about this domain" link to a third-party domain-enquiry form featuring a "Price Offer" field. This shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to solicit purchase offers in the past. This contradicts the Respondent's statement that he isn't interested in selling the disputed domain name.

The Panel also noted a December 2022 screenshot showing that the disputed domain name resolved to a page title of "Pydantic - What, When, Why?" stating "UNDER CONSTRUCTION" and including a "Feature request" linked to a URL "www.pydantic.com/demo", with a form asking for name, email, phone and message. A feature request is a software-development term of art, and the URL of that feature points to a "demo", another software-development term. This gives the false impression that the website was a features request site for the Complainant's software development team.

It is also to be noted that the Complainant's mark, with which the disputed domain name is identical, is a coined term. The Panel independently ran Internet searches for the mark, time-limited to results published

prior to registration of the disputed domain name. All of the results across the first few pages relate to the Complainant's offering.

The Panel has independently established that the Respondent was the successful respondent in *SolidX Partners Inc. v. Darya Grygoryeva / Viktor Cherkasov*, WIPO Case No. D2015-0571, where he stated that "the sale of domain names is a large part of how" he and his wife "make their living". So the Respondent is versed in the registration of domain names, and he was aware of the requirements under the UDRP before the domain name was registered.

In the circumstances, the balance of probabilities is such that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark prior to registering the disputed domain name and that he sought to capitalize on the Complainant's growing notoriety, probably by selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant. Alternatively, given that the Respondent appears to own or have owned thousands of domain names and trades in them, and given his sophistication as a computer science professional, he should have known that the disputed domain name would be identical to the Complainant's mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

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

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <pydantic.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/
Jeremy Speres
Sole Panelist
Date: November 9, 2026