ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Bain & Company Inc. v. Domain Addmin, Ewire
Case No. DAI2026-0089

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bain & Company Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Sullivan & Worcester LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Domain Addmin, Ewire, United States, internally represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bain.ai> is registered with Ewire (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 2, 2026. On October 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 October 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 28, 2026. The Respondent requested and was granted an automatic four calendar day extension for response until November 1, 2026. The Respondent also requested an additional ten-day extension, to which the Complainant objected. This request was denied. The Respondent submitted a Response on November 1, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on November 2, 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 global management consulting firm founded in 1973 and headquartered in Boston, Massachusetts, United States, with 19,000 employees and offices in 40 countries. The Complainant operates a website at "www.bain.com", which includes numerous citations to the Complainant's media stories, awards, and recognition in the United States and globally. The Complainant's website highlights artificial intelligence ("AI") challenges and strategies from the home page onward. The Panel notes frequent references in the media to the Complainant as one of the "Big Three" management consulting firms, as indicative that its BAIN mark is globally well-known and long-established.[1]

The Complainant owns the <bain.com> domain name (Annex 8) apparently since 1994.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations including the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Reg. Number	Reg. Date	Nice Class(es)
BAIN (word)	United States	4274595	January 15, 2013	35, 36
BAIN (word)	European Union	013250188	January 20, 2015	35, 36
BAIN (word)	International Trademark (multiple designations)	1298453	March 7, 2016	36
BAIN (word)	United States	5205930	May 16, 2017	36

The disputed domain name was registered on December 16, 2017, and is currently registered in the name of the Respondent "Domain Addmin" with the organization "ewire", listing a postal address in the State of New York, United States and an email address at [xxx]@ewire.com. The Panel notes that the domain name used for this email address is associated with "eWire", which is listed as the Registrar. According to the Response, the Respondent is an investor in domain names for resale or development and acquired the disputed domain name by purchase on September 28, 2020.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a landing page hosted by GoDaddy with a button to "Get This Domain", leading to a page advertising GoDaddy's domain name broker services.

The Complaint attaches a screenshot showing that in early July 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a website hosted by GoDaddy offering the disputed domain name for sale for USD $495,000 or alternatively on "lease to own" terms. Shortly after the Complainant contacted the Respondent, the disputed domain name resolved to a landing page simply referring interested site visitors to the GoDaddy Domain Broker Service.

The Complainant's counsel sent a demand letter to the Respondent on July 8, 2026. The Respondent replied by email saying that it would respond "substantively" by August 15, 2026, and subsequently that it was represented by counsel. The Complainant's counsel followed up with communications on July 23 and July 28, 2026, but received no response.

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.

---

[1] See, e.g., Wikipedia articles on "Bain & Company Inc." and "Big Three (management consultancies)". Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of a Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.8.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its registered BAIN mark and that the Respondent has no permission to use the mark, is not known by a corresponding name, and is not making bona fide commercial use or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, attempting to sell it to the Complainant or a competitor for an excessive price, specifically by offering it for sale for USD 495,000.

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. The Respondent does not dispute that the Complainant holds BAIN trademark registrations but observes that "bain" is a dictionary word in French (meaning "bath") and also an English and Scottish surname, arguing that the Complainant does not have an exclusive claim to its use as a domain name.

The Respondent asserts that it registered the disputed domain name as part of a portfolio of approximately 300 domain names, "mostly short .ai and .com names" such as <myagent.ai> and <id.ai>, "held for investment and development". The Respondent states that the disputed domain name was similarly acquired for investment and development and "not to target the Complainant, its marks or its business" and notes that the Complainant raised no objection until six years after the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name.

The Respondent denies ever contacting the Complainant to sell or lease the disputed domain name or using it with any reference to the Complainant or hosting links with confusing content. The Respondent denies any pattern of abusive registrations. The Respondent observes that the disputed domain name "currently" resolves to GoDaddy's "standard marketplace landing page", which does not refer to any business or industry and does not display a price.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered BAIN word 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.

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 Complainant has not licensed the Respondent to use the Complainant's mark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by a corresponding name or has made use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent claims a legitimate interest as an investor in domain names based on short, common words or names, although the Response lists only two domain names as examples and attaches no proof of registration or sales of these or other domain names. Because of domain privacy rules, it is not possible to verify the Respondent's claim independently. Moreover, the Respondent does not address the evidence showing that the disputed domain name was offered for sale recently for nearly half a million USD, which logic suggests is more likely a figure based on its trademark value than on its value associated with French baths or British genealogy. On top of that, the two names cited by the Respondent have a general meaning in the agentic and AI space, in contrast to the disputed domain name that does not share such meaning relation except insofar as the Complainant's own activities are concerned (i.e., "my agent" and "id" are in the same category and relate to AI, unlike "bath" which cannot reasonably be said to be in such category).

The Panel finds on the available records that 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 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. All of these presume an intention to target the Complainant's mark.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's well-known and long-established mark, which is not an English dictionary word in contemporary use but rather a family name used as the Complainant's well-known company name and mark, and also a French word. Both are unlike the other "ai"-related words mentioned by the Respondent as typical of its portfolio. The disputed domain name is likely to cause confusion with the mark, and this likelihood is compounded by the ccTLD ".ai", given the Complainant's emphasis on AI challenges and strategies. Thus, also noting the Complainant's use of the ".com" domain name and the lack of any discernable connection between the two cited names owned by the Respondent and "bain" or "bath" as it relates to AI (any more than literally any term or product could be said to be impacted by AI), the Respondent's prior awareness and intent may be inferred here, despite the Respondent's denial of such intent, from the fact that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark, which is well-known and long-established and does not correspond to a common English word, as well as the fact that the Respondent advertised the disputed domain name for sale for a very high price, USD 495,000.

These circumstances appear on their face to fit the example of bad faith described in the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(i), registering a domain name primarily for the purpose of selling or leasing it to the trademark holder or a competitor for an amount in excess of out-of-pocket costs. The Respondent did not approach the Complainant directly, but the disputed domain name would clearly be worth more to the Complainant or a competitor than to any other potential buyer. It is revealing that the Respondent does not deny that this advertisement was published (or that the Respondent was ultimately responsible for it) but merely states that the disputed domain name "currently" resolves to GoDaddy's "standard marketplace landing page", which does not display a suggested purchase price.

The evidence in the case file as presented indicates that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

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 <bain.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/
W. Scott Blackmer
Sole Panelist
Date: November 3, 2026