

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Turnitin, LLC v. david@jenni.ai
Case No. DAI2026-0070

1. The Parties

Complainant is Turnitin, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Advance Legal, United States.

Respondent is david@jenni.ai, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <turnitin.ai> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 7, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to Complainant on July 9, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on the same day.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on August 15, 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 the Complaint:

“Complainant owns and operates the globally well-known education technology business using its distinctive and famous trademark TURNITIN.”

“Complainant has used the TURNITIN mark continuously in the U.S. and international commerce since at least 1999 in connection with plagiarism detection, originality checking, grading, AI analysis and review services, and related educational technology services.”

“TURNITIN is the leading educational software services provider in its field and is widely recognized by educators, institutions, and students globally.”

According to Complainant, its services are provided in more than 140 countries.

Complainant owns the domain name <turnitin.com>, and has used that domain name to host its commercial website.

Complainant holds various registrations for the trademark TURNITIN, including United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) Reg. No. 2,812,598, registered on February 10, 2004 in connection with, Educational services, namely providing on-line grading; statistical analysis; plagiarism detection; peer review; class assignment, submission and retrieval; and class information services accessible through the Internet or through an Intranet, with a January 31, 1999 date of first use in commerce.

The Domain Name was registered on October 15, 2019. The Domain Name does not resolve to an active website. According to Complainant, “the e-mail address associated with the [Domain Name] registration [...] presents itself as an AI academic writer and research tool for students and academics.”

On June 22, 2026, Complainant’s counsel sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Registrar and Respondent. No reply was received from Respondent.

Respondent has not disputed any of the foregoing allegations.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel concludes that Complainant holds rights in the mark TURNITIN through registration and use demonstrated in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Name is identical to that mark.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your 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) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are 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.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Respondent has not come forward in this proceeding to explain himself or articulate any possible bona fides vis-à-vis the Domain Name.

The Panel concludes, on this undisputed record, that Complainant's TURNITIN mark is distinctive, and has been used for more than 25 years in many jurisdictions. Absent any countervailing explanation from Respondent, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent was aware of the TURNITIN mark when registering the Domain Name. Respondent's apparent connection with educational services closely related to Complainant's services – Respondent has not disputed Complainant's characterization of him as "an AI academic writer and research tool for students and academics" – reinforces this conclusion. It appears probable on this record that Respondent's intent was to take advantage of the renown of Complainant's trademark to enhance his own business pursuits. Such a motivation does not invest Respondent with rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

The Panel concludes that Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation", are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in "bad faith":

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has 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 Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel concludes, under the Policy and the record presented here, that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the "Rights or Legitimate Interests" section. Again, the Panel finds on this undisputed record that Respondent registered the Domain Name with Complainant's mark in mind.

With respect to bad faith use of the Domain Name, the "passive holding" of a domain name, under well-established UDRP precedent, can be consistent with a finding of bad faith use under the Policy. The Panel so finds here noting in particular the reputation of the Complainant's trademark and the identical composition of the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 Domain Name <turnitin.ai> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2026