

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Mamed Suleimanov, Report.ge LLC v. Petar Ivanov  
Case No. DGE2026-0002

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Mamed Suleimanov, Report.ge LLC, Georgia, represented by Global Management LLC, Azerbaijan.

The Respondent is Petar Ivanov, Bulgaria, self-represented.

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

The disputed domain name <report.ge> is registered with Caucasus Online LLC (the .GE Registry).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 24, 2026. On February 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the .GE Registry a request for registry verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 25, 2026, the .GE Registry 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/Proxy Service”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 26, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the .GE Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 26, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .GE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the .GE Policy), the Rules for .GE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the .GE Rules), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .GE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Supplemental Rules).

In accordance with the .GE Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 27, 2026. In accordance with the .GE Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on March 4, 2026. The Center received a first unsolicited supplemental filing from the Complainant on March 4, 2026. The Center received an unsolicited supplemental filing from the Respondent on March 6, 2026. The Center received a second unsolicited supplemental filing from the Complainant on March 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on March 11, 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 .GE Rules, paragraph 7.

On March 19, 2026, the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 to the Parties. This stated that the Panel had decided to accept the Parties' unsolicited supplemental filings (described above) and that the Respondent was invited, if interested, to comment on the Complainant's second unsolicited supplemental filing dated March 10, 2026. The Respondent was invited to submit any relevant comments by March 24, 2026, and the due date for the Decision was extended to April 7, 2026. The Respondent did not file any reply to Procedural Order No. 1 by the applicable deadline.

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

The Complainant is a limited liability company incorporated and registered in Georgia, registered on May 17, 2018. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name was originally registered by the Complainant on May 23, 2018. The Complainant supports this assertion with a historic Whois entry dated November 1, 2021, showing it as the registrant. The Complainant also produces screenshots from the Internet Archive "Wayback Machine" showing active editorial content over a period of several years. The said screenshots show the following:

A. An overview page, indicating that there have been 168 screenshot captures taken between March 5, 2016, and November 13, 2025.

B. One of two available entries for 2019, which is dated November 22, 2019, showing a website in the Georgian language bearing the title "REPORT NEWS AGENCY". The Complainant states that this shows an active Georgian news agency, and a full editorial site which confirms genuine media use of the disputed domain name.

C. A screenshot similar in appearance to B. above, dated April 15, 2024, which the Complainant says shows the disputed domain name still operating as news platform within one year of its expiry, which it adds demonstrates that it has not been abandoned.

D. A screenshot dated November 13, 2025, showing what the Complainant says is a pay-per-click ("PPC") parking site, although said screenshot does not display any advertisements but rather a parked page indicating the disputed domain name is for sale.

E. A screenshot, not from the Internet Archive "Wayback Machine", which the Complainant says is from February 2026, and which the Complainant says displays PPC advertising, although no actual advertisements are displayed – the screenshot instead appears to show broken or incomplete content. At the top of the page, a banner states in what appears to be the Russian language, "Купить этот домен" ("Buy this domain") and then in the English language, "More domains at Seo.Domains".

The Complainant is the owner of Georgian Registered Trademark Number 31858 for a figurative mark consisting of the words "REPORT NEWS AGENCY", where the first word appears in a horizontal hatched-style striped typeface having stripes in black color excepting the letter "O" which is in similarly hatched in red color and forms an image of the globe, with the words "NEWS AGENCY" beneath the said first word in a wider spaced, smaller, red colored, sans-serif typeface, registered on October 15, 2019, in Class 38 (telecommunications and communication services).

The disputed domain name was registered on April 16, 2025. The Parties are agreed that the disputed domain name was not renewed by the Complainant and returned to the general pool for registration, whereupon it was "drop-caught" by the Respondent on the day it became available for registration. The Respondent is an individual based in Bulgaria who has a connection to a domain name investment company,

“Seo.Domains,” which apparently holds over 30,000 domain names, which it says is engaged in the registration of generic publicly available domain names, and operates a drop catching system, such as was used in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant produces a negative review on “Trustpilot” of the Respondent’s company which states that said company registered a deleted domain name after drop and sold it afterwards “for 1000x more”. The Respondent’s company replied to said review that “once a domain expires and is not renewed by the previous owner within a period it is “up for grabs,” the fact that we have made a business out of an opportunity in the market does not make us terrible people [...] how we value the domains that we catch is based entirely on market demand”.

After the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the Parties engaged in correspondence with the Complainant initially approaching the Respondent anonymously and offering USD 200 for the disputed domain name on April 16, 2025. On April 18, 2025, the Respondent quoted a price of USD 7,500. On April 22, 2025, April 27, 2025, and May 4, 2025, a representative of the Respondent followed up this correspondence seeking an answer from the Complainant’s anonymous proxy. By July 30, 2025, the Respondent proposed a new price of USD 4,500, valid for a limited time. On October 15, 2025, the Complainant’s proxy proposed a price of USD 500 but the Respondent replied that it preferred to keep the disputed domain name. On January 12, 2026, the Complainant’s head of information technology wrote openly to the Respondent explaining the history of the disputed domain name, including that it had been used by the Complainant for many years to cover news and events in Georgia, and noting that the Respondent “acquired this domain through legitimate means after it became available”. In said email, the Complainant requested that the disputed domain name be transferred to it “as a gesture of goodwill”. On January 13, 2026, the Respondent replied that the price of the disputed domain name was USD 7,500.

The Complainant produces an undated screenshot of the website at <seo.domains> which is operated by or on behalf of the Respondent. The screenshot shows a listing of the disputed domain name at the price of USD 7,500 under the category “Media / Subcategory: Russian links” with a “date added” of October 15, 2025. The listing also states in respect of the disputed domain name, “Links from 943 domains (8 EDU. 2 GOV). 9 years of history as a website of a media” [sic].

On March 7, 2026, the Respondent’s organization issued a newsletter listing various domain names for sale with a subject line of “Kalin’s Picks: Fintech Giant, Massive EDU Trust & Medical Authority” in which it stated, “Today’s selection features assets that have passed the strictest editorial filters in the world: tier-one media, global universities, and scientific journals”. With regard to one domain name, the email stated “[...] To rank for loans or fintech, you need absolute trust. This 13-year-old domain has it. Links from Bloomberg, FT, and NYT make this asset practically bulletproof”. With regard to another, the email added, “This domain was a primary care respiratory journal for nearly two decades. Links from Springer and BioMed Central give it the exact academic footprint required to dominate health SERPs”.

## **5. Parties’ Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

In summary, the Complainant contends in the Complaint (and amendment to the Complaint) as follows:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark because it incorporates the word “report” which is the dominant and most distinctive element of the said trademark. The additional words of the trademark, “news agency”, are descriptive of the category of services and do not serve as source identifiers. The Complainant is also incorporated by a legal entity name reflecting the disputed domain name. The Complainant has made prior use of the disputed domain name as its primary news website from May 2018 to March 2025, a period of approximately seven years, with editorial content being evident on historic screenshots between at least November 2019 and April 2024.

Since re-registration, the disputed domain name has been used exclusively for a domain name parking and for sale page, constituting commercial exploitation, not a bona fide offering of goods or services. The

Respondent holds no trademark rights in the term “report” in Georgia, and operates a domain name brokerage marketplace with over 30,000 domain names for resale. The Respondent has no substantive connection to the word “report”, the country of Georgia, or news media. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been known by the disputed domain name, which is exclusively associated with the Complainant’s history as a Georgian news agency. The Respondent’s use is commercial, demanding USD 4,500 to 7,500 for the disputed domain name, and operating a commercial parking page. The Respondent’s profile lists domain name trading as a professional activity, confirming speculative intent. The disputed domain name status “HiddenInWhois” actively conceals the Respondent’s identity, and a party with rights or legitimate interests has no reason for such concealment.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name to sell it to the Complainant at a price exceeding the registration cost. The Respondent deliberately increased the price upon identification of the Complainant, which is unambiguous evidence of bad faith. The Respondent’s platform promotes automated backorder acquisition of expiring domain names, capturing brand-associated domain names at the point of lapse, constituting a pattern of bad faith conduct recognized by the .GE Policy.

The original deletion date of the disputed domain name matches the date of the current registration, establishing that the Respondent used automated drop catching software, although the disputed domain name had been a well-known Georgian news website for seven years. No legitimate reason exists for a foreign domain broker with no connection to Georgia or news media to target the disputed domain name other than to exploit its brand value. Internet users searching for the Complainant’s website encounter the Respondent’s parking page, creating a likelihood of confusion as to source or sponsorship, and commercially exploiting traffic built by the Complainant over seven years. The Respondent also operates a systematic pattern of identity concealment via the status of the disputed domain name and a registrar privacy service, together with use of an intermediary registrar, such multi-layered anonymity being inconsistent with good faith registration and awareness of the wrongful nature of the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is connected to or acting on behalf of a professional domain name squatting operation, the portfolio of which consists of over 200,000 domain names, constituting strong evidence of a pattern of conduct of registering domain names to prevent trademark owners from reflecting their marks in corresponding domain names or for the purpose of commercial resale. Such speculators who register well-known third party terms without any legitimate purpose or prior rights act in bad faith, and the size of the Respondent’s operation removes any possibility of an innocent or coincidental registration. The Respondent’s company publicly confirms that it engaged in drop catching, confirming that the disputed domain name was registered as part of a deliberate, profit-driven interception strategy, constituting bad faith under the .GE Policy.

The use of a privacy service rather than a transparent registration in the name of the Respondent’s company demonstrates bad faith, as it was intended to obstruct identification of the Respondent, and a legitimate registrant has no reason to conceal its identity. The delegation of the disputed domain name to a commercial PPC monetizing service confirms the use of the disputed domain name to generate advertising revenue rather than any legitimate purpose, whereby the combination of a professional speculation enterprise, concealed identity and active monetization leaves no doubt about the bad faith nature of the disputed domain name’s registration and use. Neither the Respondent nor the related company has any rights or legitimate interests in the term “report” within the Georgian namespace, they are not commonly known thereby, have any connection to Georgia, or have made any bona fide offering of goods or services under such name.

## **B. Respondent**

In summary, the Respondent contends in its Response as follows:

The Complaint fails to satisfy all three required elements under the .GE Policy, and the Panel should deny the Complaint.

The Complaint is based upon a flawed premise. The registration of a common generic, English dictionary word in a country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) does not constitute cybersquatting. The disputed domain name was acquired after the Complainant voluntarily allowed it to lapse, and the Complainant holds no exclusive rights over the term “report”. The Respondent had no targeted intent to exploit any trademark via the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent operates a legitimate and established domain name marketplace with over 30,000 domain names. The business model is the lawful acquisition of publicly available domain names, including previously expired domain names, for resale on the open market, a well-recognized, legal, and widespread commercial practice in the domain name industry. The Respondent acquires domain names through automated systems that monitor publicly available expiry and deletion schedules, which systems place backorders on domain names with generic keyword value across a wide range of commercial sectors. The Respondent does not target trademark holders or brand owners.

The disputed domain name was previously registered by the Complainant but was deleted and entered the public registration pool on April 16, 2025, whereupon the Respondent’s automated system registered it via standard drop catching procedures. The disputed domain name was then listed for sale at a market price reflecting its generic keyword value. At no point prior to registration did the Respondent conduct any investigation into the prior registrant of the disputed domain name, or their alleged trademark rights or business identity. The disputed domain name was acquired solely on the basis of its generic keyword value as a short, meaningful English word in a ccTLD.

The Complainant contacted the Respondent in January 2026 regarding the disputed domain name, whereupon the Respondent engaged in good faith negotiations and offered the disputed domain name for commercially reasonable prices. The Complainant’s first offer of USD 200 was declined as not reflecting the market value, and the Respondent’s counteroffer reflected standard market pricing rather than bad faith. Neither threats nor demands were made relating to reputational harm, and the Respondent remained open to a negotiated resolution.

The Complainant’s mark is a figurative/composite mark combining a common word with a descriptive phrase. It does not own a mark for the standalone word “report”. The scope of protection of its mark is narrow, and does not prevent third party use in an unrelated commercial context. It has numerous legitimate meanings and uses in commerce, and the Complainant cannot therefore claim exclusive rights over it. Nevertheless, the Respondent does not contest the first element for the purposes of procedural economy, while noting that the generic nature of the term is highly relevant to the third element analysis.

The Respondent’s business of acquiring and reselling domain names is a bona fide commercial activity recognized by panels under the UDRP Policy, and the disputed domain name was acquired as part of the Respondent’s established portfolio business, not to target any trademark holder. The Respondent’s business lists thousands of domain names publicly and is consistent with a legitimate commercial operation. Numerous domain name investors legitimately hold and sell generic keyword domain names without targeting any specific brand, and the Respondent’s interest in the disputed domain name is consistent with such practice. The Respondent is not required to develop active content to establish a legitimate interest as domain name investing is a recognized commercial activity that does not negate such interest.

Drop catching is a well-established and lawful commercial practice that is not, by itself, evidence of bad faith. To demonstrate bad faith, the Complainant would have to demonstrate that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant’s mark, and mere coincidence of timing between deletion and registration of the disputed domain name is insufficient. The Respondent’s system processes thousands of domain names, and there is no evidence that the disputed domain name was selected for any reason other than its generic keyword value.

Panels under the UDRP have consistently held that pricing a domain name above its registration cost does not constitute bad faith without something more. The disputed domain name was offered at fair market value for its type and the Parties simply disagreed on price, with the Complainant’s opening offer being far below

market value. Dynamic pricing during negotiations in response to a buyer's identity and demonstrated urgency is standard commercial practice and does not constitute bad faith exploitation of a trademark. The Respondent had no obligation to sell at any particular price.

The use of privacy services is a widespread, industry-standard practice which protects against spam and unwanted solicitations rather than any evidence of intent to hide wrongdoing. There is no pattern of conduct in the Respondent's portfolio that establishes a pattern of cybersquatting without evidence of specific targeting of trademark holders. No evidence of prior adverse UDRP decisions against the Respondent has been produced, nor any other instance of bad faith conduct.

The Respondent had no actual or constructive knowledge of the Complainant, its mark or its operations at the time of registration. "Report" is a common English word used globally across hundreds of legitimate business contexts. The ".ge" ccTLD is a small market and the Complainant's figurative mark would not be known to a Bulgarian domain name investor conducting automated drop catching activities across dozens of ccTLDs. The Complainant bears the burden of proving the Respondent registered the disputed domain name because of the Complainant's mark, which burden has not been met.

### **C. Complainant's First Supplemental Filing**

In summary, the Complainant contends in its first supplemental filing as follows:

The Response is constructed around the UDRP conjunctive standard which is not applicable to the present proceeding. All six UDRP decisions cited by the Respondent are based on this standard.

The generic nature of the term in the disputed domain name does not operate as a defense when the disputed domain name had a seven year operational history under the Complainant's brand in the Georgian market, and where the Respondent used the Complainant's identity as a factor in pricing.

The Response states that the Respondent applied dynamic pricing in response to a buyer's identity, meaning it raised the asking price on identification of the Complainant as the prior trademark holder. This goes directly to bad faith use.

The Response does not disclose that there are prior adverse domain name dispute decisions against the Respondent and its organization, which are directly relevant to the assessment of whether the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct within the meaning of the .GE Policy, and the weight to be accorded to the Respondent's characterization of its practices as legitimate commercial activity, notably:

*International Business Machines Corporation v. Petar Ivanov* [BG]8011123228, WIPO Case No. DNU2020-0003, <ibm.nu>, transfer. PPC parking page, offer to sell following cease and desist, no Response. The factual background is identical to the present case.

*Navasard Limited v. Petar Ivanov*, WIPO Case No. [DMD2021-0001](#), <1xbet.md>, transfer. Panel found Respondent held 251 domain names incorporating well-known trademarks and concluded this constituted a pattern of cybersquatting.

*Bulgari S.p.A. v. Tool Domains Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [DRO2019-0012](#), <bvlgari.ro>, transfer. Panel held that the Respondent's statement regarding registration of 600,000 domain names, offer to sell the domain name concerned, and registration of further well-known trademarks belonging to third parties as domain names blatantly demonstrated a lack of legitimate interest in such domain name.

*Credit Agricole SA v. Metodi Darzev, Tool Domains Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [DNU2019-0006](#), <credit-agricole.nu>, transfer. Panel found pattern of bad faith registrations incorporating third party trademarks.

*Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co. Kg. v. Metodi Darzev, Tool Domains Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [DNU2019-0004](#), <boehringer-Ingelheim.nu>, transfer. Typosquatting, parking page and sale offer, bad faith found.

The entity Tool Domains Ltd is connected to the Respondent via the administrative email address associated with the disputed domain name. Panels in domain name disputes have consistently treated this organization's practice of mass registration of third party trademarks, PPC parking and above-cost offers of sale upon identification of the trademark holder as cybersquatting.

With regard to the Respondent's claim of dynamic pricing and buyer's demonstrated urgency, this is a direct admission that the Respondent raised prices upon identifying the Complainant as the trademark holder. The Respondent does not deny that it raised its asking price upon identifying the Complainant as the prior trademark holder, merely defending this as commercially standard. It is sufficient that the disputed domain name is used to extract above-market value from a trademark holder on the basis of its identity and interest in its own mark, which the Respondent admits occurred here. As proof of use in bad faith is sufficient under the .GE Policy, the Respondent's admission satisfies the third element of the .GE Policy.

The Response refers to the conjunctive requirement from the UDRP regarding bad faith although, under the .GE Policy, proof of registration or use in bad faith suffices. The Respondent claims no knowledge of the Complainant, its trademark or operations at the point of registration of the disputed domain name but same day registration on the exact day of deletion requires active monitoring of the specific domain name, noting that the Respondent's own business evaluates search engine optimization history whereby seven years of indexed history would be plainly visible. The Respondent cannot simultaneously profit from a domain name's identity-linked search engine optimization value and claim ignorance of such identity. The Respondent adjusted its price on the basis of such identity during negotiations, presupposing investigation and recognition of the Complainant's interest in the disputed domain name.

#### **D. Respondent's Supplemental Filing**

In summary, the Respondent contends in its supplemental filing as follows:

The difference between the UDRP and the .GE Policy is acknowledged but in any event the Complainant has not discharged its burden under either limb of the third element.

The disputed domain name was acquired through an automated system that monitors the relevant zone file for deletions and evaluates candidates based on objective SEO metrics, namely, domain authority score, backlink count, historical traffic, and keyword value. It does not research the identity of prior registrants, the existence of trademarks, or the reasons for deletion. The acquisition of the disputed domain name was driven entirely by generic keyword value and not by connection to the Complainant or its business. There is no obligation to conduct a clearance search, and no such search is required by law or policy. The assertion that prior search engine optimization metrics would have revealed the disputed domain name's history conflates numerical signals with brand identity research. A score derived from seven years of news publishing does not, on its own, identify a trademark owner or signal the existence of trademark rights. The disputed domain name was processed as one of many high domain authority keyword assets, not a targeted acquisition. The timing of the acquisition does not constitute evidence of specific targeting, and the disputed domain name was evaluated simultaneously along with every domain name expiring on that day.

The disputed domain name was listed for sale on a public marketplace, available to any interested buyer, this being a well-established and lawful commercial activity confirmed by numerous domain name dispute panels which find that the listing of a domain name for sale, even for profit, does not constitute bad faith use absent additional evidence of intent to target a trademark holder specifically. The pricing adjustment in respect of the disputed domain name occurred during commercial negotiations in January 2026, nine months after registration. Bad faith use must be assessed in terms of how the disputed domain name is being deployed, not in the context of pricing adjustments in arms-length negotiations. Adjusting a price based on the buyer's demonstrated interest and commercial profile is standard practice in any secondary market

including real estate and art, and does not constitute exploitation of a trademark. The Complainant was never threatened or coerced and was free to use any alternative domain name or to pursue legal remedies. The initial asking price was set before the Complainant's identity was known, consistent with market pricing for a short, high-authority, generic domain name in the applicable ccTLD. No adjustment was driven by an intent to extract value from trademark rights. The website associated with the disputed domain name has never resolved to content targeting the Complainant's brand, redirecting its users, or competing with its services. There has been no PPC page exploiting the Complainant's trademark, no imitation of its portal, and no communication threatening such brand. The disputed domain name has been inert pending resale which does not constitute use in bad faith.

The prior cases mentioned by the Complainant are factually distinguishable, and all unambiguously associated with well-known international trademarks. No generic keyword value could explain them, unlike the disputed domain name here, and it does not share a pattern whereby a finding of pattern-based cybersquatting could be made. The Respondent operates a large portfolio of domain names whereby five adverse domain name dispute decisions represent a figure that falls within the range of statistical coincidence for a large-scale registrant. Finding a pattern of bad faith would penalize legitimate large-scale domain name investment inconsistent with established jurisprudence.

The Complainant holds a composite mark for REPORT NEWS AGENCY that does not extend protection to the generic word "report" across all industry contexts. It remains a common, widely used English word with no inherent distinctiveness. The Respondent's registration does not infringe such trademark, which relies on the combination of words for its distinctiveness.

#### **E. Complainant's Second Supplemental Filing**

In summary, the Complainant contends in its second supplemental filing as follows:

The Respondent's supplemental submission relies upon the fact that the registration of the disputed domain name was carried out by an automated system without knowledge of the prior owner or trademark significance. However, the Respondent's own marketplace listing contradicts this claim as it describes the disputed domain name as having nine years of history as a media website with a Russian-language identity and a media-specific backlink profile, not as a generic, high-value, English keyword. This was generated by the Respondent's own platform to attract buyers in the media and search engine optimization industries. The Respondent cannot simultaneously maintain that its system had no knowledge of the prior history of the disputed domain name and publish a listing that leads with that as the primary selling point.

The co-founder of the Respondent's organization sent a marketing email to the Complainant's representative illustrating that its offered domain names are identified by commercial brand identity and marketed according to historical reputational value in a process described as "editorial" despite the fact that the Respondent now describes it as "numerical". The Respondent's system routinely identifies the prior brand identity of an acquired domain name, for example, one domain name is described as having been "a primary care respiratory journal for nearly two decades", demonstrating brand research, not metric aggregation. The said email states "P.S.: "Our inventory holds 220,000+ assets. If you have a specific target, my team can acquire it."" This targeted acquisition proposal contradicts the Respondent's claim that its system operates blindly without specific targeting, and shows that the Respondent is willing to perform domain name acquisition directed at specific brands or entities. Said marketing email was sent the day after the filing of the Respondent's supplemental submission, while the Respondent was asserting that its organization had no knowledge of nor capacity to identify specific brands.

The Respondent argues that its pricing adjustment occurred nine months after registration, however, bad faith use is independently sufficient under the .GE Policy. The Respondent's conduct of using the disputed domain name as leverage to extract above-market consideration from the trademark holder constitutes bad faith use regardless of timing.

The listing of the disputed domain name on the Respondent's marketplace was published on October 15, 2025, six months after registration, with the media history as its primary selling point. The disputed domain name was not inert but was actively marketed from that date onwards with the history as the core value proposition.

The Complainant does not dispute the absence of a PPC parking page connected to the disputed domain name. Such absence does not establish the absence of bad faith use, and previous panels have held that passive holding can constitute bad faith use. The relevant question is whether the disputed domain name was used in a manner that exploits the Complainant's trademark, established here by the Respondent's listing which markets its media history as its primary commercial attribute.

The Respondent's statistical argument regarding adverse decisions against it does not stand up to scrutiny. In *Bulgari S.p.A. v. Tool Domains Ltd, supra*, the Respondent's organization stated that it had been "through hundreds of disputes" arising from its registration practices. Such self-reporting cannot subsequently characterize five documented decisions as a statistically insignificant coincidence. The pattern of conduct is established by its consistent methodology.

## 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.<sup>1</sup>

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the .GE Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Complainant's registered mark is figurative, and contains the words REPORT NEWS AGENCY. The Complainant effectively argues that a dominant feature of the word element of the mark (the word "report") is reproduced within the disputed domain name and therefore that confusing similarity is established. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The Complainant argues for such dominance based upon the fact that the additional terms ("news agency") are descriptive of the category of services, while "report" would be the most distinctive element. However, the Panel notes that the word "report" itself has an evocative quality, given that the product of a news agency is typically referred to as a "report". Given the Panel's findings with regard to the Complainant's unregistered trademark rights, as outlined below, the Panel does not require to make a final determination on this issue.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the .GE Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

In cases involving unregistered or common law marks (which may include domain names actively used in business to identify the source of goods or services) that are comprised solely of descriptive terms or acronyms that are not inherently distinctive, panels require the complainant to present relevant and sufficient examples of evidence of acquired distinctiveness/secondary meaning. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. Here, the Complainant has established that it operated a news agency under the name and mark REPORT.GE (in other words, via the disputed domain name) for about seven years, during which time the mark was used continuously to describe the Complainant's primary news website.

---

<sup>1</sup>Given the similarities between the .GE Policy and .GE Rules on the one hand, and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP") and associated rules on the other hand, the Panel considers some UDRP precedents as well as the applicable sections of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") relevant to the present proceeding and will refer to them where appropriate (except to the extent of relevant differences between the policies, such as the absence of a conjunctive requirement for bad faith).

While the term in the disputed domain name is descriptive, and not inherently distinctive, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has crossed the necessary threshold, even though it would have preferred to see more evidence, including the extent of the userbase of the said news website. Nevertheless, the Complainant demonstrates continuous use of the website formerly associated with the disputed domain name as a news platform over an extended and substantial period. Although the term “report” is descriptive in the context of news services, this does not prevent it from acquiring distinctiveness through use, particularly in a country where, as here, English is not an official language. The Panel notes that where a respondent’s conduct demonstrates that it has targeted a complainant’s mark or the goodwill associated with it, such conduct may reinforce the proposition that the complainant’s mark has come to function as a source identifier, notwithstanding its descriptive origin. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. In this case, as discussed further below, the Respondent’s own listing for the disputed domain name expressly emphasizes the Complainant’s multi-year media history and backlink profile. This evidences recognition of the Complainant’s mark as having commercial identity, and thus reinforces the Complainant’s claim of acquired distinctiveness for the purposes of the first element.

It must also be noted that the Respondent states that it does not contest the first element for the purposes of procedural economy, albeit maintaining its position that the “generic” nature of the term in the disputed domain name is highly relevant to the third element analysis under the .GE Policy.

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 .GE Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests and Registered or Used in Bad Faith**

In some cases, panels assess the second and third elements together, for example where clear indicia of bad faith suggest there cannot be any respondent rights or legitimate interests. In such cases, panels have found that the facts and circumstances of the case would benefit from a joint discussion of the policy elements. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.15. This is the situation here, and the Panel proceeds accordingly.

Under the .GE Policy, the Complainant needs only to establish use in bad faith under the third element, not (as in the UDRP) a conjunctive requirement of both registration and use in bad faith. Where there is clear indicia of use in bad faith, for example, in the sense of the specific targeting of the Complainant’s trademark, it would follow that there cannot be any Respondent rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

On the topic of use in bad faith, the Complainant points out that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale. Crucially, in its second supplemental filing, the Complainant shows that the marketplace listing for the disputed domain name at the website associated with <seo.domains> states “Links from 943 domains (8 EDU. 2 GOV). 9 years of history as a website of a media” [sic]. Given that the Respondent accepts that it has listed the disputed domain name for sale, and that it designs itself in the Response (under the heading “II. PARTIES”) as “Petar Ivanov Seo. Domains Sofia, Bulgaria” the Respondent must be taken to be responsible for the nature of the listing on the said marketplace website.

The focus of the listing of the disputed domain name is not on the (English) dictionary value of “report”. On the contrary, the features of the disputed domain name are exclusively described in terms of its prior use by the Complainant, namely the backlinks generated during the Complainant’s period of ownership, and the Complainant’s multi-year history in using the disputed domain name for a media website. In *Phi Delta Kappa International, Inc. v. Andrew Lancaster, UniCurve*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5150](#), the respondent similarly argued that its acquisition of the domain name concerned was based on standard considerations and was not acquired for any brand association, residual goodwill, or to target the complainant. However, the panel noted: “[...] the Respondent’s reference to backlinks appears to disregard the fact that the backlinks in question were generated during the Complainant’s ownership of the disputed domain name, and related to

the Complainant's then website content. In the view of the Panel, to benefit from these backlinks, even if only by way of SEO enhancement, is therefore to take advantage of the commercial goodwill previously created by the Complainant. Whether the taking of such advantage is unfair, as the Policy requires, is another question, and it is certainly possible to conceive of cases where benefiting from a former owner's goodwill may not be unfair: however, the Panel finds that unfair advantage has been taken in this case".

In the present case, the evidence shows that the Respondent's declared interest in the sale listing is related to the goodwill built up by the Complainant over its multi-year use as its news website and trademark. Any dictionary value is viewed by the Panel to be secondary to this, particularly as it is not even noted in the listing, which exclusively focuses on the (Complainant's) prior use. This demonstrates to the Panel's satisfaction that the Respondent's interest in the disputed domain name directly derives from the Complainant's goodwill. The Panel cannot see the offering of the disputed domain name for sale on that basis as a use of the disputed domain name in good faith, since the listing is predicated upon, and takes unfair advantage of, the Complainant's trademark rights. The described value in the listing equates to the trademark value of the term, not the dictionary value. There is no doubt in the Panel's mind that before the listing was written, the trademark value of the disputed domain name had been researched by the Respondent, or systems put in place by the Respondent, or by others acting on the Respondent's behalf, and on its instructions. It is this value that the Respondent targets.

If a valuation and sale listing by a dealer in domain names takes unfair advantage of the trademark rights of the previous registrant of the disputed domain name, as here, then the Panel considers that the use is in bad faith, and the Respondent must bear the consequences of that fact. By way of Procedural Order No. 1, the Respondent was invited to reply directly to the Complainant's submissions regarding the nature of the listing, and its assertion that this conclusively contradicted the Respondent's claims. Despite the terms of the listing being clearly placed in issue by the Complainant, and despite the Panel's invitation to comment, the Respondent chose not to make any reply. This itself speaks volumes to the Panel. Furthermore, it cannot be overlooked that the Respondent's business activities have previously been found to cross the line into cybersquatting, indicating that the Respondent not only should be familiar with the standards considered for abusive domain name registration and use, as well as that its particular brand of domain name investing has been considered from time to time to amount to both registration and use in bad faith in appropriate cases.

As discussed at the beginning of this section, it follows that if the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith in the manner described, the Respondent cannot claim rights and legitimate interests in it, for example, on the basis that it contains a dictionary word. While the acquisition of a common dictionary word in a domain name for subsequent resale may give rise to a legitimate interest in an appropriate cases (see for example, the discussion in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10) this is not such a case.

The Panel observes that both of the Parties expended considerable effort and focus on their submissions regarding whether the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, with particular emphasis on the Respondent's asserted "drop-catch" acquisition methodology and process. However, pursuant to the .GE Policy, a finding of bad faith use is dispositive, such that the question of bad faith registration is rendered moot. The Panel needs only to observe for completeness that not all "drop catching" according to the Respondent's system would necessarily be regarded as amounting to registration in good faith either, if by using such a system the Respondent were found to be wilfully blind to trademark rights, and the value of the domain name concerned derives primarily from such trademark rights (see: *Supermac's (Holdings) Limited v. Domain Administrator, DomainMarket.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0540](#)).

The Panel finds that the second and third elements of the .GE Policy have been established.

## 7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the .GE Policy and 15 of the .GE Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <report.ge> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrew D. S. Lothian/*

**Andrew D. S. Lothian**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 7, 2026