

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Portcullis (Singapore) Pte Ltd and Portcullis Global Services Pte Ltd v. M Al Hafiz, MAH

Case No. DCO2026-0034

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Portcullis (Singapore) Pte Ltd, Singapore and Portcullis Global Services Pte Ltd, Singapore, internally represented.

The Respondent is M Al Hafiz, MAH, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <portcullis.co> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 2, 2026. On April 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 2, 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 (Registration Private c/o Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on April 3, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 4, 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 April 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on April 28, 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 facts are undisputed.

The Complainant¹ is part of a group of companies known as the “Portcullis Group”, which offers trust, fund, fund administration, corporate secretarial, accounting, family office and other related services, with headquarters in Singapore. It was founded in 1984 and has over 40 years of continuous operation across the Asia-Pacific region. It has offices operating under the name Portcullis in inter alia Singapore, Hong Kong, China and Taiwan Province of China.

The Complainant, Portcullis (Singapore) Pte Ltd, owns the trademark PORTCULLIS in various jurisdictions, including but not limited to a Singaporean trademark registration PORTCULLIS, with registration number T06/25511J and a registration date of April 10, 2007 for services in class 35 and an Indonesian trademark registration PORTCULLIS, with registration number IDM000489149 and registration date of August 9, 2022, also for services in class 35.

The Complainant, Portcullis Global Services Pte Ltd, previously owned the disputed domain name prior to its acquisition by the Respondent. The disputed domain name was first registered by the Complainant, Portcullis (Singapore) Pte Ltd, in 2015 and was transferred to Portcullis Global Services Pte Ltd in July 2024.

The registration of the disputed domain name was due for renewal on February 1, 2026 and its grace redemption period lapsed on March 15, 2026. The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent, one day later, on March 16, 2026, who registered the disputed domain name through the Registrar with a privacy service.

At the time of filing the Complaint and at the time of rendering this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a home page under the heading “The Portcullis Family” and “Portcullis is one of the largest independent corporate, trust, fund and family office service providers in Asia” and including in the footer the name of the “Portcullis Group” and the address of the Complainant.

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 the following.

The Respondent (1) published a clone of the legitimate Portcullis Group website and (2) listed the disputed domain name for resale on Afternic (the Registrar’s own marketplace) and on the Registrar website.

The registration and use by the Respondent is a textbook cybersquatting case.

¹ The Panel will refer to both Complainants as the “Complainant” in singular if there is not useful reason for distinguishing between the two.

The Respondent added a link to “www.ots.portcullis.co”, which appears to be a gaming or gambling site.

B. Respondent

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

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 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 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 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.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the Respondent clearly attempts to impersonate the Complainant on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, as claimed, impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its considerations under 6.B.

Based on the evidence provided undisputed by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on March 16, 2026.

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 agrees with the Complainant that the registration and use by the Respondent is a text book example of cybersquatting. The Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name inter alia to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, as claimed, impersonation, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, 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 <portcullis.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2026