

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Caura Ltd v. Segah Meer  
Case No. DCO2025-0064

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Caura Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Segah Meer, United States of America, self-represented.

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

The disputed domain name <caura.co> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 11, 2025. On August 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 12, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 12, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 15, 2025.

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 August 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 7, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on August 24, 2025. The Complainant filed a Supplemental Filing on September 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant was incorporated in 2018 and has, since 2020, offered an “all-in-one” motor vehicle management mobile application for drivers under its CAURA trademark in the United Kingdom. The number of users of the Complainant’s application has increased from around 900 in 2020 to over 350,000 in 2025.

The Complainant owns the domain name <caura.com>, which it acquired in 2019 and which it uses for its primary website.

The Complainant’s CAURA mark is registered in numerous jurisdictions, including United States of America Trademark Registration No. 6533226 CAURA in classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 42, and 44, having a registration date of October 26, 2021.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 12, 2014, and resolves to an “under construction page” when accessed at “caura.co”, and a website entitled “Caura & Co” and “Information Services - Big Data, Application Development, Software” when accessed at the subdomain “www.caura.co”. The Respondent’s evidence establishes that the disputed domain name has been used for an IT services business specifically relating to data analytics since at least 2016.

#### **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 was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant’s mark, and to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for an amount in excess of the Respondent’s out-of-pocket costs related directly with the disputed domain name.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent contends that it has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name flowing from its use of the disputed domain name for a legitimate IT services business since registration of the disputed domain name in 2014, predating the Complainant’s incorporation in 2018 and the launch of its application in 2020.

The Respondent requests a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (“RDNH”) on the basis that the Complainant was aware that the disputed domain name was registered prior to the Complainant launching and obtaining trademark rights.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### A. 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. Paragraph 10(b) of the Rules; *Société aux Loteries en Europe, SLE v. Take That Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0214](#); WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.6.

The Response contained an allegation of RDNH, and the Panel agrees with the statement made by the Panel in *Cosmos European Travels AG v. Eurotech Data Systems Hellos, Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0941](#) to the effect that a complainant facing an allegation of RDNH is "entitled to defend itself". To that extent, the Panel admits the Complainant's Supplemental Filing.

### 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

### C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Given the Panel's findings in relation to the third element below, there is no need to consider the second element.

### D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered in 2014, before the Complainant was incorporated, launched its mobile application, or obtained trademark rights.

In pre-Complaint correspondence, the Respondent stated to the Complainant: "I inherited this domain from a prior owner." The Complainant relies on this statement to argue that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name at some point after the Complainant began trading under its CAURA mark. The Respondent, in its Response, claims to have been the original registrant of the disputed domain name in 2014 and has presented Internet Archive evidence showing consistent usage of the disputed domain name for the same IT services website since at least 2016.

The Respondent's earlier statement, quoted above, does not necessarily mean that the Respondent only acquired the disputed domain name at some point after the registration date of 2014 or after the Complainant began trading, and does not necessarily contradict the Respondent's statement in its Response that it registered the disputed domain name in 2014. It is quite possible that the 2014 registration date is the date on which the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name from the prior owner, and it is quite possible that this is what the Respondent meant in its Response when stating that it registered the disputed domain

name in 2014. The Panel is aware that registrar policies differ on when the registration date in the Whois record for a domain name is updated in the event of a transfer. The Complainant has not presented any evidence contradicting this or showing that it is more likely than not that the Respondent only acquired the disputed domain name after the Complainant commenced trading.

In any event, based on its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has independently viewed publicly accessible Whois history records for the disputed domain name, which show that the Respondent, with the same name and email address, has been the listed registrant for the disputed domain name since at least 2017. The Panel has also viewed the Internet Archive records for the disputed domain name, which show consistent usage of the disputed domain name for the same website since 2014 at the “www.” subdomain. This all shows that it is more likely than not that the Respondent has owned the disputed domain name from a date pre-dating the Complainant’s existence and its trademark rights.

In the absence of any evidence suggesting any targeting of the Complainant, there is no basis for claiming that the Respondent registered or acquired the disputed domain name in bad faith with the Complainant in mind, who clearly did not exist at the time.

### **E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at RDNH or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute RDNH. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

The Complainant’s trademark rights, and first usage of its mark, postdate registration or acquisition of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, and the Complainant is represented by counsel, which are both relevant factors supporting a finding of RDNH. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

However, the Respondent’s statement that it “inherited this domain from a prior owner” does at least suggest that the Respondent may have acquired the disputed domain name after the Complainant began using its mark. The Respondent also offered to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant in pre-Complaint correspondence. Finally, it is quite plausible that the Complainant may have missed the fact that the disputed domain name is used for an active website for an IT services business given that the disputed domain name resolves to an “under construction” page when accessed at “caura.co” as opposed to the subdomain “www.caura.co”.

This all suggests that it was not entirely unreasonable of the Complainant to bring the Complaint, and that it is possible that the Complainant genuinely believed this to be a case of cybersquatting.

On balance of probabilities, the Panel does not consider it more likely than not that the Complaint was brought in bad faith.

Furthermore, the Respondent requests additional remedies in the form of censure and monetary relief. However, the Panel notes the scope of the UDRP and available remedies is limited and the UDRP does not provide a mechanism for such additional remedies. Accordingly, the Panel declines the Respondent’s request for additional remedies.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Jeremy Speres/*

**Jeremy Speres**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2025