

PANEL DECISION

Wuzheng Europe Single Member Limited Liability Company v. Pierridis
Konstantinos / Konstantinos Pierridis
Case No. DEU2026-0019

1. The Parties

Complainant is Wuzheng Europe Single Member Limited Liability Company of Greece, represented by Panagiotis Tharouniatis, Greece.

Respondent is Pierridis Konstantinos / Konstantinos Pierridis of Greece.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <wuzheng.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains (“EURid” or the “Registry”). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is PDR Ltd.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 4, 2026. On May 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 7, 2026, the Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the “ADR Rules”) and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 15, 2026. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

On June 12, 2026 and June 14, 2026, Respondent sent email communications in the form of Response to the Center.

Procedural Issue: Late Response

The Complaint was filed on May 4, 2026. Respondent filed a response after the due date for Response, namely on June 12 and June 14, 2026.

The Panel notes that Respondent invoked a medical condition for his delay in submitting the Response, without any evidence of it. After consideration of Respondent's submission the Panel has decided to accept it for the sake of completeness.

4. Factual Background

Respondent was employed by Complainant from February 24, 2020, until March 13, 2026 as an Information Technology technician. During his employment Respondent registered the disputed domain name in his own name.

Complainant is the owner of the European Union trademark registration No. 018489590, WUZHENG (word), filed on June 9, 2021 and registered on October 16, 2021 for goods and services in international classes 7, 12, 35, 37 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 13, 2020 and was used as corporate email system for Complainant. Currently it leads to a "coming soon" website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Per Complaint, Respondent was instructed by Complainant to register the disputed domain name in the name and on behalf of Complainant within the scope of his professional duties. Subsequently, on March 13, 2026, Complainant terminated Respondent's employment contract. Upon his dismissal, Respondent surrendered assets and records belonging to Complainant but not the administrative credentials (passwords) for the disputed domain name. On April 15, 2026, during a meeting with Complainant's legal representative, Respondent requested the sum of EUR 120,000.00 as consideration for the transfer of the disputed domain name to Complainant. Following this demand, Complainant conducted an inquiry into the registration details of the disputed domain name and found out that it had been registered in the name of Respondent. Complainant's email communications are currently disrupted and its employees are currently in a state of communication isolation due to the total failure of the corporate email system.

B. Respondent

Respondent sent email communications in the form of Response to the Center on June 12, 2026 and June 14, 2026. Per the response, Respondent was employed by Complainant from February 24, 2020 to March 13, 2026. Respondent acknowledges that he registered the disputed domain name, at the beginning of his employment, in his own name so that it could be used as an email address for Complainant. In particular, per Respondent, it was created and used as part of an email communication solution developed by Respondent during his employment with the Complainant. Respondent stressed that registration happened before Complainant acquired any trademark rights on WUZHENG. Per Respondent, he had informed

Complainant that the disputed domain name was registered in his own name and Complainant had approved that “and used the system for many years”. No evidence was provided for this “approval”.

Respondent confirms that Complainant was using the disputed domain name as its email address. Respondent claims that it was him that maintained and financed the disputed domain name through “accounts, subscriptions and resources under his control”. Respondent maintains that he never offered the disputed domain name for sale. Respondent claims that upon termination of the employment relationship, Respondent delivered to Complainant all passwords, credentials and authentication keys, documentation and other materials “relating to the Company’s information technology systems”. Respondent claims that he did not target Complainant because at the time of registration of the disputed domain name Complainant had not yet registered its trademark. Respondent claims that Complainant has failed to establish bad faith registration. Per Respondent, the “registration was neither concealed nor deceptive”. Respondent suggests that Complainant has failed to establish the elements of the UDRP and also that the dispute falls outside the scope of the Policy as it is a broader dispute between former parties to an employment relationship.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules, in order for the Complaint to succeed, it is for Complainant to establish:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law and;
- (ii) that the disputed domain name has been registered by Respondent without rights or legitimate interests in the name; or
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the WUZHENG trademark of Complainant.

The disputed domain name incorporates the trademark of Complainant in its entirety.

The country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) “.eu” is disregarded, as ccTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons only.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the WUZHENG trademark of Complainant.

The fact that the registration of the disputed domain name predates the Complainant’s WUZHENG trademark does not by itself preclude the Panel’s finding of identity under the first element, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) section 1.1¹.

Complainant has established Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under Paragraph B(11)(e) of the ADR Rules, a respondent may demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests to the domain name for purposes of Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) by showing any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation:

¹ The Panel follows prior decisions under the UDRP and, given the similarities between the ADR Rules and UDRP, finds it appropriate to refer to UDRP jurisprudence, including reference to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

(1) prior to any notice of the dispute, the respondent has used the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with the offering of goods or services or has made demonstrable preparation to do so;

(2) the respondent, being an undertaking, organisation or natural person, has been commonly known by the domain name, even in the absence of a right recognised or established by national and/or European Union law;

(3) the Respondent is making legitimate and non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent to mislead consumers or harm the reputation of a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by national law and/or European Union law.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

As per Complainant, Respondent was not authorized to register the disputed domain name in his name. The disputed domain name was created in order to be used as an email address for Complainant.

Complainant established that Respondent was its employee and that it never authorized Respondent to register the disputed domain name in his own name or use the WUZHENG trademark in any way for his own benefit and that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, on the contrary this is Complainant's name.

Prior to the notice of the dispute, Respondent did not demonstrate any use of the disputed domain name or a trademark corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In view of the above, there is no evidence on record giving rise to any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the part of Respondent.

Furthermore, per Complainant, it appears that Respondent is holding on to the disputed domain name as leverage in his post-employment termination negotiations.

The Panel notes that even if Respondent's allegation were true, although no evidence thereof was submitted, that Complainant authorized or approved Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name when he was serving as Complainant's employee, Respondent no longer works for Complainant and no longer has any permission to maintain and use the disputed domain name. Respondent's status as a former employee does not give Respondent any current rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (see *SAGE Development Authority v. Peter Little Horn* WIPO Case No. [D2025-3791](#), *The Glorja Kaufman Dance Foundation v. Carolyn B. Baker & Assoc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0034](#), *Central Coast Evaluation Services v. Michael Aponte*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2213](#)).

Complainant has established Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

There is no need to separately address bad faith registration or use, in view of Panel's finding that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, in this case the Panel briefly considers that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

Because Respondent was an employee of Complainant and knew of Complainant's rights in the WUZHENG mark, Respondent had Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. Per Complaint, Respondent was instructed to register the disputed domain name, in the name of Complainant and instead, Respondent registered it in his own name. Complainant claims that he was unaware of that until recently, which the Panel finds plausible, in view of Respondent's claims that he was the one managing

and paying for the disputed domain name “for several years”. The Panel notes at this point, Respondent’s repeated allegation in his Response that his good faith registration is based on the fact that Complainant’s trademark right was registered after the disputed domain name registration. The fact that the registration of the disputed domain name predates the Complainant’s trademark registration does not alter the Panel’s finding of Respondent’s bad faith registration. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s mark/company name. Furthermore, Respondent was an employee of Complainant and therefore knew very well of Complainant’s rights in this name. Under [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1/3.8.2, even if a company’s trademark is unregistered or nascent at the time of registration, Panels use section 3.8.1 to look at “insider knowledge”. If an employee uses internal corporate information to register a domain in their own name, it is treated as an act of bad faith meant to preemptively capitalize on or hold hostage the company’s digital assets. Even if the Panel were not to make a finding regarding the bad faith registration, it appears that currently the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith (and under the ADR Rules it is sufficient to prove either bad faith registration or use).

As regards bad faith use, Complainant maintained and Respondent did not persuasively rebut that on April 15, 2026, during a meeting with the Complainant’s legal representative, Respondent requested the sum of EUR 120,000.00 as consideration for the transfer of the disputed domain name to Complainant. Furthermore, per Complainant, Respondent has not delivered to Complainant, following termination of his contract, the password for the disputed domain name, with the result that Complainant’s employees are left without an email communication system.

Under these circumstances and on this record, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Complainant has established Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <wuzheng.eu> be transferred to the Complainant. ²

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2026

²As the Complainant established in Greece, which is the Member State of the European Union it satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration of the disputed domain name set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517. The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.