

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Showpad naamloze vennootschap v. Peter Lam  
Case No. DAI2025-0057

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Showpad naamloze vennootschap, Belgium, represented by Winger Trademarks BV, Belgium.

The Respondent is Peter Lam, United States of America ("United States" or "USA"), self-represented.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <showpad.ai> (the "Disputed Domain Name") 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 November 3, 2025. On November 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On November 4, 2025, 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 November 5, 2025, 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 November 12, 2025.

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 November 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 3, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on November 13 and 18, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on December 10, 2025. 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 December 12, 2025, the Complainant filed a supplemental submission (the "Complainant's Supplemental Filing"). For reasons discussed below, the Panel will admit this filing. On January 8, 2026, the Panel issued a Procedural Order (the "Procedural Order") in the following terms:

**"Background**

On December 12, 2025, the Complainant filed an unsolicited supplemental submission. For reasons that will be set out in its decision in due course, the Panel will admit this filing. This submission in large measure addressed issues arising in relation to the business plan which forms Annex 3 to the Response (the "Business Plan").

**Procedural Order**

The Respondent is granted leave to file a Supplemental Response dealing with the matters raised in the Complainant's supplemental filing, not to exceed 2000 words in length. This response should if possible (1) explain exactly how and when the Business Plan was created; and (2) provide copies of contemporaneous documents which evidence or corroborate the date the Respondent says the Business Plan was created. This Supplemental Response is to be filed on or before January 15, 2026. The due date for the Panel's decision is extended until January 22, 2026"

The Respondent filed a Supplemental Response on January 13, 2026.

**4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is a Belgian software company founded in 2011, providing sales enablement software to corporate clients globally. The Complainant describes its software as "unlocking the full potential of every salesperson by uniting the entire revenue team around the content, coaching, training, analytics, and buying experiences needed to win more deals in one intuitive, AI-powered ecosystem". The Complainant operates its main website at "www.showpad.com" and serves over 1,400 clients across various industries. It operates in over 50 countries and is dual-headquartered in Chicago and Ghent, Belgium, with additional offices in London and Bucharest, and is supported by a diverse global workforce.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for SHOWPAD in multiple jurisdictions, including for example European Union Trademark Registration No. 009493156, registered on April 26, 2011, and United States Trademark Registration No. 4343529, registered on May 28, 2013. These trademarks are referred to as the "SHOWPAD trademark" in this decision.

The Respondent is an individual resident in California, USA. He has held a California real estate license since 2005, though the license is currently in "LICENSED NBA" (non-working) status. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on April 24, 2023.

The Disputed Domain Name currently resolves to a GoDaddy landing page offering domain brokerage services and offering for sale the Disputed Domain Name for EUR 9,015.

In September 2025, the Complainant, through a GoDaddy domain broker, offered to purchase the Disputed Domain Name for EUR 9,000. The broker countered with a price of USD 100,000, citing "strategic importance in the competitive AI marketplace." When the Complainant invoked its trademark rights, the broker indicated an offer in the "upper 5 figure range" would be required. Negotiations went no further and the Complainant filed this proceeding.

On June 27, 2023, the Complainant publicly announced the implementation of Artificial Intelligence ("AI") within its software/platform.

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Regarding the first element, the Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to its SHOWPAD trademark, save for the addition of the ".ai" Top-Level Domain, which is a standard requirement and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Regarding the second element, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. The Complainant contends the Respondent is not commonly known by the name "Showpad," has made no demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name, and has not made any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant in its supplemental filing challenges the credibility of the Respondent's business plan, noting it appears to have been drafted using AI assistance and lacks contemporaneous evidence of genuine business planning.

Regarding the third element, the Complainant contends the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The Complainant argues that registration in April 2023, during the height of AI industry excitement and shortly before the Complainant's June 2023 AI announcement, demonstrates opportunistic targeting. The Complainant further points to the Respondent's demand for USD 100,000 as evidence of intent to sell the Disputed Domain Name at a price vastly in excess of out-of-pocket costs. The Complainant emphasizes the distinctiveness of its SHOWPAD mark and its high awareness in the IT and AI market segments, arguing the Respondent must have been aware of the trademark.

### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the required elements under the Policy. Regarding rights and legitimate interests, the Respondent asserts that he registered the Disputed Domain Name for a legitimate real estate visualization service to be called "Show Pad," combining the real estate industry terms "show" (referring to property showing) and "pad" (referring to living space). The Respondent states the ".ai" extension was chosen to reflect planned use of artificial intelligence in the service. The Respondent provided evidence of his California real estate license (held since 2005) and a business plan for the intended service (see further below).

The Respondent emphasizes that he operates in a completely different industry (real estate) than the Complainant (B2B sales enablement software), with no overlap in customer base or use case. The Respondent states he has made no use of the Disputed Domain Name, launched no website, created no email addresses, served no advertisements, and made no attempts to profit from or mislead users.

Regarding bad faith, the Respondent argues the critical fact that he registered the Disputed Domain Name on April 24, 2023 – before the Complainant's public AI product announcement on June 27, 2023. The Respondent contends it is impossible to target a product or business direction that had not yet been publicly announced. The Respondent maintains he has never contacted the Complainant and has held the Disputed Domain Name passively with legitimate future plans.

The Respondent in his Supplemental Response stated as follows:

"I'm an independent real estate agent and I run my business on my own. I'm submitting this response to explain how I did my planning and to address the points the Complainant has raised.

When I mentioned a “Business Plan” in my earlier response, I didn’t mean a formal, written document. I didn’t create anything dated or meant for investors. I was talking about the way I thought through my business as a small business owner. I considered ideas like branding, how I might use technology in my work, the types of clients I wanted to focus on, and how my business could grow over time. These ideas came together slowly and informally, mostly on my own and in my head.

This planning began in early 2023, around the same time I registered the disputed .ai domain in April 2023. I registered the domain because I was exploring a future oriented real estate idea and thought an .ai domain could be a good fit. At that time, I had no knowledge of the Complainant or its trademark. They didn’t factor into my decision at all, and I never intended to target them.

Because my planning was informal, there isn’t a single date when a “business plan” was created or finalized. As a sole proprietor, I didn’t prepare formal paperwork, seek outside funding, or work with consultants. At the time, I had no reason to think that these informal ideas would need to be documented for a legal proceeding. Considering the domain was an .ai and I had no reason to expect a dispute.

I chose the .ai domain because it’s generally associated with technology and artificial intelligence and because it fit the type of real estate services I was thinking about for the future of my business. I did not register it to target the Complainant, to take advantage of their name, or to create confusion. I have not used it to impersonate the Complainant, mislead anyone, or draw customers away. My only intention in registering it was to hold it for possible future use in my own business as it develops.

Even though I don’t have formal documents showing this planning, everything I have said here is true and reflects how small, independently run businesses operate. The lack of paperwork doesn’t mean the planning wasn’t real, and it doesn’t suggest bad faith. I respectfully ask the Panel to consider that my registration of this domain was made in good faith and that I have a legitimate interest in it.

Thank you for your time and consideration”.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **Procedural Matter - Admissibility of Complainant’s Supplemental Filing**

There is no entitlement under the Rules to file such a statement. It is a matter for the Panel’s discretion whether to allow it. In the present case it deals with matters the Complainant cannot have known about when it filed its Complaint. Notably the Respondent’s status as a licensed Californian realtor, and the business plan he has placed in evidence. The Panel considers it appropriate for the Complainant to comment on these items and allows the filing to be admitted. As indicated above the Respondent has been afforded the opportunity to respond to this Supplemental Filing and has done so.

### **Substantive Matters**

To succeed, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical with 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;
- (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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the SHOWPAD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. The addition of the ".ai" Top-Level Domain is a standard requirement and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.

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 any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

- (i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel must therefore consider whether the Respondent has come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests.

The Respondent in effect says that paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy applies in that he has made demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name which was apparently evidenced by the business plan he has produced. This document is undated. It is 8 pages long, appears to be internally consistent and is not self-evidently pretextual. Some sections of it have been redacted. The Complainant in its supplemental submission analyses this document in some detail. It notes that there is no metadata which allows the document to be dated. In summary, it suggests it has likely been produced using AI tools and is pretextual. The Respondent in its Supplemental Response does not take issue with what the Complainant has said in this regard. The Panel therefore concludes the "Business Plan" is not a contemporaneous document but was created, probably with the assistance of AI tools, in the context of preparing the Response. The Respondent has not directly explained his thought process in creating this document but the Panel infers the

Respondent's case is that it is an "after the event" creation intended to summarise what was in his mind at the time he registered the Disputed Domain Name. If the Response is carefully analyzed nowhere does the Respondent directly say anything that contradicts this position. Indeed his signed statement which is annexed to the Response does not mention the Business Plan at all. Nevertheless the Panel thinks the way it was presented was misleading and likely intended to give the impression it was a contemporaneous document.

The Respondent has provided evidence of a long-standing connection to the real estate industry through his California real estate license, first obtained in 2005. While the Complainant notes this license is currently in non-working status, this does not negate the fact of the Respondent's apparent long-standing connection with the real estate field, which provides context for his stated plans. At the same time, it is not obvious to the Panel to what extent "show pad" as combined is a term used in the real estate industry. There is no evidence in this regard.

The Panel finds assessing this issue far from straightforward on the facts of this case. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2 notes as follows: "What qualifies as prior use, or demonstrable preparations to use the domain name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services?

As expressed in UDRP decisions, non-exhaustive examples of prior use, or demonstrable preparations to use the domain name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services may include: (i) evidence of business formation-related due diligence/legal advice/correspondence, (ii) evidence of credible investment in website development or promotional materials such as advertising, letterhead, or business cards, (iii) proof of a genuine (i.e., not pretextual) business plan utilizing the domain name, and credible signs of pursuit of the business plan, (iv) bona fide registration and use of related domain names, and (v) other evidence generally pointing to a lack of indicia of cybersquatting intent. While such indicia are assessed pragmatically in light of the case circumstances, clear contemporaneous evidence of bona fide pre-complaint preparations is required.

Acknowledging that business plans and operations can take time to develop, panels have not necessarily required evidence of such use or intended use to be available immediately after registration of a domain name, but the passage of time may be relevant in assessing whether purported demonstrable preparations are bona fide or pretextual.

If not independently verifiable by the panel, claimed examples of use or demonstrable preparations to use the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services cannot be merely self-serving but should be inherently credible and supported by relevant pre-complaint evidence."

It is unfortunate that the Respondent has not been able to produce contemporaneous material. It is also significant that the Respondent has not done anything to progress this business plan since registering the Disputed Domain Name. On balance the Panel does not consider the Respondent has produced sufficient evidence to rebut the inference the Complainant has raised. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to establish he has any rights or a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

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

## **B. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy a non-exhaustive list of factors evidencing registration and use in bad faith comprises:

(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

- (ii) you have registered 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; or
- (iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

The Complainant's case is that paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy applies – the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name because it corresponded to the Complainant's SHOWPAD trademark and he anticipated being able to resell it to the Complainant at a profit. It seems to the Panel that a number of factors have to be taken into account when assessing this allegation. First, there is nothing in the record to suggest the Respondent would have any knowledge of the Complainant's trademark before he registered the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel accepts the Complainant is a successful international company and its SHOWPAD software is well known and well regarded in the field of sales support software. That is however a relatively specialized field and the Complainant has not produced any evidence to suggest it is well known in the real estate field or more generally. Second, the Panel notes that in the real estate context, the terms "show" and "pad" have recognized meanings distinct from the Complainant's coined trademark SHOWPAD. "Show" is a common real estate term for property viewings, and "pad" is colloquial for a living space or apartment (for example in the usage "bachelor pad"). The combination "Show Pad" while certainly not grammatically obvious as a combination, can arguably be understood as descriptive or suggestive in the real estate visualization context, separate from its trademark significance in the sales enablement software field. Third, the Respondent is a long standing real estate professional (albeit not practicing). He has not taken any steps to hide or conceal his identity (beyond the routine use of a privacy shield which is not uncommon). There is no evidence he has registered any other domain names. There is no evidence of him approaching or targeting the Complainant, merely responding (via the relevant broker) when the Complainant offered to purchase the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel is conscious that proceedings under the Policy are of a limited and restricted nature, do not involve oral hearings, discovery or cross examination, and hence are only applicable to clear cut cases, and it is not usually appropriate to decide disputed questions of fact or matters of truth or falsehood. That does not however mean the Panel cannot reach a conclusion as to the veracity of a case that is being advanced where the only evidence that is provided is in the form of conclusory statements that are inherently not credible, and which are not supported by relevant corroborative or third party evidence. The Panel does not consider this to be a case where the Respondent's case can be dismissed on that basis. Notwithstanding the fact that the Respondent placed in evidence an after-the-fact AI-generated business plan without explaining clearly its status, the Panel considers that the Respondent's case is at least not inherently lacking in credibility, and is consistent with his long-standing status as a licensed (if inactive) Californian realtor. At the same time, for companies of any size and global reach, it is fairly obvious that the ".ai" Top-Level Domain would be an obvious domain name expansion opportunity these days; this raises the possibility that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and sought to take advantage of beating the Complainant to the Disputed Domain Name. Looking at the evidence as a whole the Panel on the balance of probabilities cannot however discount the Respondent's case, and is unable to conclude that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name because he sought to extort the Complainant.

The Panel would add that it has reached this conclusion not without hesitation and regards the issue as finely balanced particularly as some factors point one way, whilst others point the other way. So the Panel regards the following factors as supporting the Respondent's position.

- There is no evidence to suggest the Complainant had any fame or reputation outside the relatively specialist field it operates in.
- It is at least conceivable that the Respondent as a real estate professional could have independently coined the term "showpad" for use in a real estate context.
- There is no evidence the Respondent has registered any other questionable domain names (or indeed any other domain names at all).
- There is no evidence the Respondent has targeted the Complainant.
- The Respondent has categorically denied knowledge of the Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Name.
- There is no evidence that the Respondent has sought to conceal or obfuscate his identity (beyond the common practice of use of a routine privacy shield).
- The Complainant initiated contact with the Respondent and sought to purchase the Disputed Domain Name for EUR 9,000.

However the following factors favour the Complainant:

- There is no evidence the Respondent has sought to progress his claimed business plan.
- The way the "Business Plan" was presented in the Response was misleading. It appears it was created "after the event" as part of the Response, probably by AI, but this was not properly explained.
- The offer to purchase the Disputed Domain Name for EUR 9000 is not so large as to be an implicit admission the Respondent had a sound case – it is a figure which can be justified on the basis of obtaining certainty and a quick resolution.
- The Respondent once he knew the Complainant was interested in purchasing the Disputed Domain Name suggested very substantial sums would be required. The Panel notes however that if a domain name was legitimately registered a subsequent offer to sell at a large price when approached by a would be purchaser cannot retrospectively alter the analysis of the original registration.

Weighing all the factors as best it can, and without the benefit of the more detailed procedures that would typically arise in court proceedings, the Panel concludes the Complainant has not carried its burden of proving it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Panel is in particular reluctant on the facts of this case to reach a conclusion the Respondent is untruthful without the benefit of the more extensive evidence that would likely be available in the context of proceedings before a competent court.

So far as the Policy is concerned since the requirements for bad faith registration and use are conjunctive, the third element is not established.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Nick J. Gardner/*  
**Nick J. Gardner**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 27, 2026