

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Marq Vision Inc. v. Balen Ciaga
Case No. DCO2026-0024

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Marq Vision Inc., United States of America.

The Respondent is Balen Ciaga, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <marqvision.co> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 13, 2026. On March 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 19, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 23, 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 24, 2026.

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 March 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin as the sole panelist in this matter on April 24, 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 following summary sets out the uncontested factual submission made by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant is a technology company that provides an innovative intellectual property enforcement platform which leverages artificial intelligence to combat online counterfeiting and brand infringement globally.

4.2 The Complainant's role in safeguarding intellectual property across digital platforms via its unique solutions have resulted in the Complainant being awarded the Spring 2025 G2 Leader award in Brand Protection and the LVMH 2022 Innovation Award for Data and Artificial Intelligence.

4.3 The Complainant owns the following valid and subsisting trademark registrations for the MARQVISION trademark (the "Trademark") in the Republic of Korea. These registrations cover services such as business management, data processing, software platforms, and online communication services.

Trademark	Trademark Registration Number	Date of Registration	Classification of Goods / Services
MARQVISION	4017306270000	May 24, 2021	9, 38, 42
MARQVISION	4017306270000	May 11, 2022	35

4.4 The Complainant promotes its Trademark through its official website using the domain name <marqvision.com>.

4.5 The disputed domain name was registered on December 18, 2025.

4.6 The disputed domain name currently redirects Internet users to the Complainant's official website located at "www.marqvision.com".

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, inter alia, as follows;

5.1 The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is identical to the Trademark for the following reasons:

- (a) the disputed domain name incorporates the Trademark in its entirety.
- (b) the addition of the country code Top Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".co" does not change that fact and was designed as such to create a false impression of association.

5.2 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because:

- (a) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Whois registration details indicate that the name of the registrant is Balen Ciaga, which has no bearing whatsoever with the disputed domain name.

- (b) the Respondent has not acquired any trademarks or trade names that correspond with the disputed domain name.
- (c) the Complainant is not related to or affiliated with the Respondent and neither has the Complainant authorised, licensed or permitted the Respondent to use the Trademark in any way.
- (d) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather to misleadingly divert Internet users. The redirection of Internet users from the disputed domain name to the Complainant's website demonstrate an absence of independence, legitimate or fair use by the Respondent.

5.3 The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith and relies on the following:

- (a) given the reputation and distinctive nature of the Trademark, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its Trademark when it sought to register the disputed domain name. A simple trademark search or internet query would have readily revealed the Complainant's Trademark registrations and expansive business operations.
- (b) it is completely implausible that the Respondent coincidentally selected an identical mark and redirected it to the Complainant's own website without prior knowledge of the Complainant's rights to the Trademark unless the intent was to exploit the Complainant's goodwill in the Trademark.
- (c) redirecting the disputed domain name to the Complainant's own website without authorization while retaining control of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith as it falsely implies ownership or endorsement. The continued retention of the disputed domain name also poses a continuous threat of altering the destination for unauthorized activities, such as phishing or commercial disruption, thereby posing substantial risks to the Complainant and the public.
- (d) at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Respondent withheld its identity and contact details, evidencing a lack of legitimate interest and bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant is required to establish the following elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (a) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (b) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (c) that 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 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 Panel is satisfied with the evidence adduced by the Complainant of various registrations of the Trademark.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Trademark 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 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 has clearly stated that it has not authorized the Respondent in any way to use the Trademark or to register the disputed domain name. The Complainant has also denied any affiliation or association with the Respondent. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark and carries a high risk of implied affiliation. The fact that it is used to redirect to the Complainant’s corporate website reinforces this implied affiliation and does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website 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 the respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on the respondent’s website or location, then this would justify a finding of bad faith.

The Panel is cognizant of the reputation and goodwill attached to the Trademark. The Panel finds that by registering and using the disputed domain name as described above the Respondent intended to pass itself off as somehow connected to or affiliated with the Complainant or the Trademark. This is supported by the following collective factors:

- (a) the date of registration of the disputed domain name, which was after the Trademark and the Complainant's domain name <marqvision.com> were registered;
- (b) the inclusion of the Trademark in its entirety in the disputed domain name; and
- (c) the manner in which the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's corporate website.

Having reviewed the record, therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <marqvision.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin/

Syed Naqiz Shahabuddin

Sole Panelist

Date: April 26, 2026