

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ifchor Galbraiths UK Limited v. chioma john, jan trading
Case No. DCC2026-0010

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ifchor Galbraiths UK Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is chioma john, jan trading, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ifchorgalbraiths.cc> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 17, 2026. On April 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 17, 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 (Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 21, 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 April 21, 2026.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on May 21, 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 Ifchor Galbraiths UK Limited, a company incorporated in the United Kingdom and headquartered in London. The Complainant is a global shipbroking company resulting from the 2022 merger of Ifchor, founded in Switzerland in 1977, and Galbraiths, a London-based firm with over 175 years of experience in the shipping industry. The Complainant provides sale and purchase services for the dry bulk, tanker, gas, and offshore and renewables markets, maintains a network of over 25 offices worldwide and over 300 employees, and has been recognized as one of the Top Ten Shipbrokers in 2023 and 2025. The Complainant has further expanded through acquisitions, including the Norwegian firm UNO Offshore, now rebranded as IG Offshore. The Complainant operates its principal website at the domain name <ifchorgalbraiths.com>, which has been active since 2022 in connection with its corporate activities and service offerings, and also runs a Shipping Course aimed at industry professionals, which has been conducted over 506 times.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations incorporating the Ifchor Galbraiths name. For the purposes of this proceeding, the Panel notes in particular the following registrations: (i) Switzerland: IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS, Reg. No. 814112, registered on May 7, 2024, for class 39; and (ii) United Kingdom: IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS, Reg. No. UK00004046458, registered on July 26, 2024, for class 39. Both registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also holds a portfolio of domain names incorporating the “ifchor galbraiths” terms and promotes its services through social media.

The disputed domain name <ifchorgalbraiths.cc> was registered on February 13, 2026, with the Registrar NameSilo, LLC, based in the United States.

According to the evidence on record, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and returns a “403 Forbidden” error page. The Panel further notes, based on its own independent verification, that at the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name remains in the same state. The record further shows that Mail Exchange (“MX”) records have been configured for the disputed domain name, enabling the use of email addresses. On March 25, 2026, the Complainant’s representative sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent, but allegedly no reply was received.

The Respondent is identified as chioma john, jan trading, located in Malaysia. The record does not indicate any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, nor does it indicate that the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to register or use any domain name incorporating the IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS mark. The Respondent did not submit a Response and was notified of default on May 15, 2026.

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 the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS trademark, in which it claims rights on the basis of registrations in Switzerland

and the United Kingdom, both predating the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name reproduces the textual component of the IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS mark in its entirety, that the design elements of their trademarks do not overtake the prominence of the word elements and may be relied upon to establish rights in the spelled-out form of the mark, and that the country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) “.cc” is disregarded for the purposes of the comparison.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS mark or to register any domain name incorporating it, and that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant submits that the Respondent holds no trademark rights in the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it, and that the non-use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant adds that the terms used in the disputed domain name are not phrases a trader would legitimately choose unless seeking to create an impression of association with the Complainant.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Ifchor Galbraiths name is well-known in the shipbroking industry, that its registered rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name by approximately two years, and that there is no plausible explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name other than to target the Complainant’s mark, particularly given that the disputed domain name replicates the Complainant’s principal domain name <ifchorgalbraiths.com> in its entirety by merely substituting the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) with the “.cc” ccTLD. The Complainant further submits that the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the passive holding doctrine, that the activation of MX records heightens the risk of impersonation and phishing, and that the Respondent’s failure to reply to the cease-and-desist letter sent on March 25, 2026 supports an inference of bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant requests that the Panel order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- i.the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar with a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii.the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- iii.the disputed domain name was 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 Select UDRP Questions (“[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 record shows that the Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations incorporating the IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS mark in Switzerland and the United Kingdom, as set out in the Factual Background above. Both registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that some of the Complainant's relevant trademarks are figurative in nature. Where a trademark contains design elements alongside textual components, panels assess the recognizability of the textual elements within the domain name, and stylized or design elements that are incapable of representation in a domain name are largely disregarded. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10. In the present case, the textual component "ifchor galbraiths" is clearly recognizable as the dominant element of the Complainant's marks and is capable of being reproduced in a domain name.

The dominant element of the Complainant's mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Disregarding the ccTLD ".cc", which is a standard registration requirement that may be disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1), the disputed domain name <ifchorgalbraiths.cc> reproduces the dominant element of the textual component of the Complainant's IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS trademark, without any additional element.

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 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 Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS mark or to register any domain name incorporating it, and that no relationship exists between the Parties. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent holds any trademark or other rights corresponding to it. The registrar-disclosed information identifies the registrant as chioma john, jan trading, a name that bears no correspondence to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. The non-use of a domain name does not in itself constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii).

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2. In any event, the composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the dominant element of the textual component of the Complainant's mark in its entirety and mirrors the Complainant's principal domain name <ifchorgalbraiths.com> with the sole substitution of the gTLD ".com" by the ccTLD ".cc", carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Panel further notes that MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name, which enables the use of email addresses incorporating the Complainant's mark and creates a concrete risk of impersonation that is incompatible with any legitimate interest.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that, as shown in the record, the Complainant's IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS trademarks have been registered in Switzerland and the United Kingdom since 2024, predating the registration of the disputed domain name on February 13, 2026 by approximately two years. The Complainant operates under the Ifchor Galbraiths brand since the 2022 merger of Ifchor and Galbraiths and has acquired recognition in the international shipbroking sector, having been listed among the Top Ten Shipbrokers in 2023 and 2025. Given the distinctiveness of the IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS mark and the absence of any descriptive, dictionary, or generic meaning of the term "ifchorgalbraiths", the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the dominant element of the textual component of the Complainant's mark in its entirety and mirrors the Complainant's principal domain name <ifchorgalbraiths.com> with the sole substitution of the gTLD ".com" by the ccTLD ".cc", confirms that the Respondent had the Complainant specifically in mind at the time of registration. It is, in the Panel's view, wholly implausible that the Respondent selected this precise combination by coincidence. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that, as submitted by the Complainant, search engine results for "ifchor galbraiths" are predominantly associated with the Complainant.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS mark in its sector, the composition of the disputed domain name as a near-identical replica of the Complainant's principal domain name, the Respondent's failure to respond to the cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant on March 25, 2026, the Respondent's default in these proceedings, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put without infringing the Complainant's rights, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel further notes that MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name, enabling the use of email addresses incorporating the Complainant's mark. Given the distinctiveness of the IG IFCHOR GALBRAITHS mark and the structural near-identity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's official domain name <ifchorgalbraiths.com>, the Panel considers that the activation of such MX records represents a significant risk of phishing, impersonation, or other deceptive activities directed at the Complainant's clients, employees, or counterparts, and constitutes an additional indicator of bad faith.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

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 name <ifchorgalbraiths.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2026