ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Blackstone TM L.L.C. v. Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd.
Case No. DIO2025-0024

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Blackstone TM L.L.C., United States of America, represented by Cowan, Liebowitz & Latman, P.C., United States of America.

The Respondent is Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd., Iceland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <blackstonedapp.io> is registered with TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 2, 2025. On July 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 4, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 2025, 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 July 7, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy"), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 July 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on August 6, 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 founded in 1985 in New York City and provides financial services, specializing in asset and investment management services.

With over USD one trillion worth of assets under management and offices worldwide, including in Cambridge, Washington DC, Houston, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Miami, Summit, Wayne, Toronto, London, Paris, Frankfurt, Milan, Mumbai, Abu Dhabi, Tel Aviv, Singapore, Seoul, Shanghai, Sydney, Tokyo, Hong Kong, China, Beijing, Dublin, and Luxembourg, the Complainant's asset management business includes investment vehicles focused on private equity, real estate, public debt and equity, non-investment grade credit, real assets and secondary funds, all on a global basis. The Complainant also provides various financial advisory services, credit services and other investment and asset management services as well as bespoke alternative asset products to individual investors and smaller institutions through its "Private Wealth Solutions" group.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for BLACKSTONE, including the following, as per trademark registration certificates submitted as annex three to the Complaint:

- United States trademark registration No. 1986927 for BLACKSTONE (word mark), filed on May 22, 1995, and registered on July 16, 1996, in international class 36;

- United States trademark registration No. 2374887 for BLACKSTONE (word mark), filed on May 06, 1999, and registered on August 8, 2000, in international class 36;

- United States trademark registration No. 6359899 for BLACKSTONE (word mark), filed on June 18, 2020, and registered on May 25, 2021, in international class 35;

- United States of America trademark registration No. 6359897 for BLACKSTONE (word mark), filed on June 18, 2020, and registered on May 25, 2021, in international class 36;

- European Union trademark registration No. 018256705 for BLACKSTONE (word mark), filed on June 18, 2020, and registered on December 23, 2020, in class 35;

- European Union trademark registration No. 000843086 for BLACKSTONE (word mark), filed on June 3, 1998, and registered on November 16, 1999, in class 36.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <blackstone.com>, which was registered on September 22, 1994, and is used by the Complainant to promote its services under the trademark BLACKSTONE.

The disputed domain name <blackstonedapp.io> was registered on May 20, 2025, and currently redirects to a cryptocurrency website at "www.crypto.com". According to the Complainant's submissions, which have not been contested by the Respondent, the disputed domain name was redirected prior to this proceeding to a website available at "https://robinhood.com/web3-wallet/", promoting self-custody cryptocurrency wallet and related services, displaying the statement: "Take control of your crypto with a self-custody web3 wallet from Robinhood" and inviting users to download a web3 crypto wallet app from the Apple App or Google Play stores.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is virtually identical and confusingly similar to the trademark BLACKSTONE in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the term "dapp", which would be an abbreviation for "decentralized application", and the country code Top Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".io".

The Complainant submits that the addition of the descriptive term "dapp" increases confusing similarity, being descriptive of a purported app used to perpetuate a scam to impersonate the Complainant.

The Complainant states that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, considering:

i) prior to the time the Complainant established rights in its BLACKSTONE mark, the Respondent did not actually engage in any legitimate business or commerce under the BLACKSTONE mark or the disputed domain name, and the Respondent was not commonly known by either of those names;

ii) the Respondent has never been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use its BLACKSTONE marks in any way including to register the disputed domain name;

iii) the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with the bona fide offering of goods and services or for any legitimate business or purpose, since the disputed domain name has been used as part of a coordinated scheme to impersonate the Complainant and is connected to a set of similar domain names that were used to promote purported financial services, including a purported crypto trading app named "Blackstone Dapp", which were the subject of a recent UDRP case won by the Complainant, i.e. *Blackstone TM L.L.C. v. putao / IULIAN OSELUS VLADUT / blackstonegroup,* NAF Claim No. FA2505002154824. In such a case, three of the domain names, <blackstonedapp.net>, <blackstonedapp.vip>, and <blackstonedapp.cc> resolved to the same webpage to which the disputed domain name resolved, instructing users to download a web3 crypto wallet app from the Apple App or Google Play stores;

iv) the Complainant's BLACKSTONE mark is so well-known that the only plausible inference that can be derived from the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name is that the Respondent registered it to take advantage of and intentionally trade on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's BLACKSTONE mark.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that, since the BLACKSTONE mark has a long and well-established reputation, thanks to its extensive use in the financial and asset management services industries, including in connection with alternative asset investments throughout the world, the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name, and intended to capitalize on that confusion to attract Internet users to the resolving website promoting similar services, taking advantage of the goodwill and brand recognition associated with the Complainant and its famous BLACKSTONE mark.

As to bad faith use, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name ostensibly to impersonate the Complainant and to cause consumer confusion and concludes that such false association and passing off in violation of the Complainant's intellectual property rights is conclusive evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant also states that, by causing initial interest confusion, the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is disrupting the business of the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.7.[1]

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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for the word mark BLACKSTONE in several jurisdictions.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "dapp", which could be interpreted as an abbreviation of "decentralized application", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

Moreover, the ccTLD ".io" can be viewed as a standard registration requirement and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 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

[1] In view of the similarities between the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the .IO Policy, the Panel will refer to the WIPO Overview 3.0 when relevant.

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 3.0, 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 Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not an affiliate or licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent obtained authorization to use the Complainant's trademark or to register the disputed domain name.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain names, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name inherently carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant consisting of the Complainant's mark and a term "dapp" (possible abbreviation of "decentralized application") which could refer to an application of the Complainant.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect users to commercial websites promoting cryptocurrency services, which are closely related to the services provided by the Complainant, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that, in light of the prior registration and use of the Complainant's BLACKSTONE mark in connection with the Complainant's services, consisting in financial, asset and investment management services, promoted online via the Complainant's website at "www.blackstone.com", the Respondent knew or should have known that its registration would be confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

Moreover, the fact that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to promote services closely related to those offered by the Complainant suggests that the Respondent was actually aware of the Complainant and its mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect users to websites promoting cryptocurrency services amounts to bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, since the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to such websites for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of such websites.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <blackstonedapp.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/
Luca Barbero
Sole Panelist
Date: August 20, 2025