ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Roblox Corporation v. Jake Arnold
Case No. DIO2026-0042

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Roblox Corporation, United States of America ("United States" or "US"), represented by Winston Taylor International LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Jake Arnold, Australia, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <roblox.io> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 21, 2026. On August 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 25, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 27, 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 amended Complaint on September 1, 2026.

The Center verified that 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 September 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on September 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres, Jeffrey M. Samuels, and Tony Willoughby as panelists in this matter on October 15, 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.

The Complainant filed an unsolicited supplemental filing on September 28, 2026. The Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 on October 21, 2026, admitting the Complainant's supplemental filing to the extent that it related to the Respondent's claimed 2015 children's toy project, the associated 2015 company registration by the Respondent, and the allegation of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH"). The Respondent was given until October 26, 2026, to respond, and did so on October 24, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a United States company that operates the Roblox online gaming and creation platform, which it says it launched in 2006.

It owns numerous registrations for the ROBLOX trademark, including United States Trademark Registration No. 3280422 ROBLOX (word), registered on August 14, 2007, in classes 9, 38, and 41, having first use in commerce dates in 2005 and 2006; and Australian Trademark Registration No. 1483928 ROBLOX (word), registered on January 8, 2013, in classes 9, 28, 38, and 41.

Per the Complainant's evidence, in a decision of March 12, 2026 (Opposition No. B 3 237 432), the European Union Intellectual Property Office found that the ROBLOX mark enjoyed a strong reputation in the European Union as of December 4, 2024.

The Respondent is an individual based in Australia. He registered the disputed domain name on May 22, 2015, in a single order with seven other domain names comprising the terms "roblock", "roblocks", "roblok" and "roblox" in the ".io" and ".systems" top-level domains.

Project records dated June 12, 2015, describe a proposed educational product for children comprising modular robotic blocks. A company named ROBLOX PTY LTD, of which the Respondent was a director, was registered in Australia on July 3, 2015, and was voluntarily deregistered on September 9, 2021. The Respondent's project management system records the project as archived on December 20, 2017.

In company-formation correspondence from 2015, post-dating registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent noted on June 12, 2015, "Need to also look into Trademarks", and his accountants commented on June 30, 2015, "we do not deal with trademarks and you may have to speak to a lawyer about this."

The disputed domain name has never been actively used. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a GoDaddy page stating: "This domain is registered, but may still be available." This remains the case.

In May 2026, a GoDaddy broker, acting for the Complainant, approached the Respondent to acquire the disputed domain name. The Respondent rejected offers of USD 830 and USD 4,150 and, when asked for a figure, replied "I would be looking at 6 figures."

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 as follows:

- Given the fame of the ROBLOX mark, the Respondent must have known of it when registering the disputed domain name;

- The Respondent's six-figure demand shows that he registered the disputed domain name primarily to sell it to the Complainant, within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, and its identity with the Complainant's mark creates an inherent risk of confusion; and

- Every name in the Respondent's portfolio of domain names closely corresponds to its mark; that the Respondent's planned product, aimed at children, may well have infringed its mark; and that the Respondent's accountant's comment that he may need trademark advice put him on notice of a potential conflict.

B. Respondent

The Respondent does not contest the first element but contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the second and third elements.

Notably, the Respondent contends as follows:

- His dated 2015 records (the domain name registration orders, project records, accountant correspondence and company registration) demonstrate preparations to use the disputed domain name for a genuine robotics project before notice of the dispute, within paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy;

- The name was derived independently from the concept of robotic blocks, and he was unaware of the Complainant in 2015;

- The Complainant's reputation evidence largely post-dates 2015, and contemporaneous material shows a more limited profile at the time, with none relating to Australia;

- The six-figure price indicator was given only after an unsolicited approach and repeated requests for a price, and does not show his purpose in 2015;

- The current GoDaddy page is generic and does not target the Complainant; and

- The Respondent requests a finding of RDNH, relying on the Complainant's anonymous acquisition attempt, its incomplete account of the broker correspondence, and its reliance on later reputation evidence.

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. [1]

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

In light of the Panel's findings in relation to the third element, there is no need to consider the second.

[1] Noting the substantive similarities between the Policy and the UDRP, the Panel has referred to prior UDRP cases and the WIPO Overview 3.1, where appropriate.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered in May 2015, and the Complainant did not put forward any evidence supporting a reputation for its mark as of the registration date. The earliest evidence speaking to a reputation put forward by the Complainant was the finding by the European Union Intellectual Property Office that the ROBLOX mark enjoyed a reputation in the European Union as of December 4, 2024. This long postdates registration of the disputed domain name.

The only substantial evidence in the record of any reputation for the Complainant's mark around the time of the registration of the disputed domain name was put forward by the Respondent. This comprised four articles dating from 2014/2015 from online gaming industry publications and the Complainant's own PR statement from 2015. These articles show a substantial user base for the Complainant's ROBLOX platform among children and teenagers before May 2015. This is the market the Respondent's robotic blocks project was aimed at. However, these articles are not as supportive of the Complainant's position as first appears:

- They describe the Complainant's platform as a "quiet" phenomenon with little profile outside its fan base;

- The only non-US source is South African, and its author, a gaming journalist, had never heard of it until writing his article in November 2014;

- One of the articles from June 2014 stated that the Complainant's platform had "built up a mammoth audience without drawing a lot of attention from outside its dedicated fan base" (emphasis added); and

- The ranking and audience figures come from the Complainant itself and relate to the United States.

As such, the only evidence before the Panel of any reputation associated with the Complainant's mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name points to the Complainant's mark primarily being known within the United States within an online gaming niche, and even then, at least one industry commentator was not aware of it until shortly before writing his article in 2014, and at least one article recognized that it had not received much attention from outside of its fan base.

Additionally, no evidence was provided showing any use of or reputation for the Complainant's mark in the Respondent's jurisdiction of Australia. The Panel accepts that the Complainant's online platform was presumably accessible from Australia in 2015. However, accessibility is not the same thing as a reputation from which knowledge on the part of the Respondent can be inferred. As an online service, it could have put forward evidence showing its Australian user base, traffic statistics from Australia, Australian subscribers, social media engagement from Australia, etc. It did not do so.

The only evidence presented related to Complainant's registration in Australia for the ROBLOX mark, which predated registration of the disputed domain name. The application to register the mark was filed in April 2012 and published and registered in 2013. The registration covers goods and services that are potentially similar to the Respondent's project, at least to some degree. The Panel notes that a mark may be registered in Australia without first presenting proof of use.

While it is true that the Respondent's internal and external correspondence appeared to recognize the need to seek trademark advice, it is not clear from the record whether any trademark searches were actually conducted that might have put the Respondent on notice of the Complainant's prior rights in its own jurisdiction.

Having recognized the need for trademark advice shortly after having registered the disputed domain name, the Respondent may potentially be considered willfully blind to the Complainant's rights in subsequently proceeding with the registration without conducting the searches that it appeared to consider necessary (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.3). However, the following considerations point away from willful blindness:

- The statements around the need for trademark advice postdate registration of the disputed domain name;

- The absence of any meaningful evidence showing that the Complainant's mark enjoyed a reputation at the relevant time;

- The Respondent explains that his choice of domain name was essentially a portmanteau of "robotic" and "blocks". The Panel considers that this is plausible in relation to "Roblox" and that the fact that the mark is coined does not necessarily mean that the Respondent should have been on notice that it might have been a trademark; and

- Even had a search been conducted and revealed the Complainant's Australian registration, it does not necessarily follow that registration of the disputed domain name would have been in bad faith. As the WIPO Overview 3.1 notes at section 3.2.3, given the possibility of coexistence across classes of goods and services, the mere fact that a search would reveal an identical third-party mark does not mean that a registration cannot be undertaken or would automatically be in bad faith. The Complainant's closest goods specification in its 2013 registration is for "stuffed toys and toy figurines" which are somewhat removed from the Respondent's robotic blocks. Trademark infringement was therefore not a foregone conclusion, and this is a question the Panel is not in a position to determine, not having the evidentiary tools available to a court.

The Respondent has denied knowing of the Complainant in 2015, and the Panel has no reason to disbelieve him. In the circumstances, and in the absence of any direct evidence showing that the Respondent actually knew of the Complainant in 2015, the evidence is not such that the Panel can infer that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's mark when he registered the disputed domain name in 2015. In other words, the evidence does not support a finding that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The position may well have been different had the Complainant adduced evidence dating from before the disputed domain name was registered showing that its mark was known beyond its niche or in Australia. This it failed to do.

In contrast to the Complainant's failure to offer evidence of reputation of its ROBLOX mark in Australia prior to 2015, the Respondent's evidence included contemporaneous records from 2015 that support his claim of having had intentions for a genuine business offering, including internal project records, an Australian company registration in 2015 for ROBLOX PTY LTD, internal correspondence, and external correspondence with his accountants.

That disposes of registration in bad faith. Noting that the Policy's bad faith requirement is disjunctive, the Complainant could still succeed on the basis of bad faith use of the disputed domain name.

However, the disputed domain name has not been used for any overt targeting. The only things that the Respondent has done with the disputed domain name, insofar as the record shows, was to have it resolve to a generic page stating that it "is registered but may still be available" and to respond to an approach from the Complainant's broker. The Complainant makes much of the six-figure price indicator set by the Respondent; however, that was in response to the Complainant's own approach, and the Respondent did nothing to proactively offer the disputed domain name to the Complainant, at least insofar as the Panel can tell from the record before it. A price given in response to a complainant's approach does not, without more, amount to bad faith. *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc. v. Robert McDonough*, WIPO Case No. D2018-1908.

Nor is there any other evidence of bad faith use. The disputed domain name has never – in 10 years – been actively used and the Panel notes that this time gap does raise a question but is not sufficient to undercut the overall lack of evidence of awareness and targeting being presented. It resolves to a generic page with no reference to the Complainant, no pay-per-click links, no competing goods or services, and no displayed price.

As to passive holding, the Panel accepts that the ROBLOX mark is now widely known. However, the Panel considers that the circumstances relied upon in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, where the doctrine of passive holding was first developed, are largely absent. The Respondent has responded and has provided credible, dated evidence of a contemplated use unconnected with the Complainant, which is, on the record before the Panel and on the balance of probabilities, quite plausible. He did not conceal his identity beyond using a privacy service offered free by the Registrar, and the underlying contact details disclosed by the Registrar were accurate. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

The passive holding doctrine was developed as a means of inferring a respondent's intentions for holding a domain name in circumstances where the panel does not have the benefit of direct evidence from which the respondent's actual intentions can be gleaned, in the form of, for example, active usage of the domain name. Here, the Panel does have direct evidence speaking to the Respondent's intentions, and that evidence points, on balance of probabilities, to good faith registration. The Respondent has not done anything since registration that might lead the Panel to conclude that his intentions have shifted from good to bad faith. The Panel also notes that *Telstra* concerned a domain name that was found to have been registered in bad faith, which is not the case here, and can be distinguished on that basis alone. The Panel therefore does not find the doctrine of passive holding applicable in this case.

The Complainant has not met its burden, on balance of probabilities, of proving bad faith usage of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking – Majority Finding

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at RDNH or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.16.

The Panel notes that the Complainant is represented by experienced counsel, and that represented parties are often held to a higher standard. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.16. In these circumstances, it was remiss of the Complainant not to tender any evidence whatsoever addressing the extent of the goodwill of its mark in 2015 or in Australia.

However, the Panel does not consider the Complaint to have been brought in bad faith for the following reasons:

- The Complainant could not have known, before filing the Complaint, of the Respondent's private 2015 project. The Respondent admits this;

- The case was not hopeless on the information available to the Complainant at the time of filing of the Complaint. The evidence suggests that the Complainant's mark was used by millions of users prior to registration of the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant had used the mark for many years. ROBLOX is a coined mark, and the mark had been registered in the Respondent's jurisdiction for a few years prior to registration of the disputed domain name;

- The Complainant should have put up evidence of its 2015 position and its reputation, if any, in Australia, but its failure to do so was an evidential shortcoming, and, in the circumstances, it may well have genuinely believed that the Respondent was targeting its mark, which was well known at the time of filing of the Complaint; and

- The position in 2015 and in Australia was not the whole of the Complainant's case. Under the disjunctive Policy, it could have succeeded on bad faith use alone, and that limb did not necessarily depend on the Respondent's knowledge in 2015.

The Majority Panel therefore declines to find RDNH.

E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking – Concurring Opinion by Tony Willoughby

The decision is unanimous save as to RDNH. In my view the Complainant's behaviour merits a finding of RDNH which is defined in paragraph 1 of the Rules as meaning "*using the Policy in bad faith to attempt to deprive a registered domain-name holder of a domain name*."

I agree with the majority that when filing the Complaint on August 21, 2026 the Complainant had reasonable grounds for believing that the Complaint would succeed. It had a successful business in the United States under its ROBLOX brand, the disputed domain name was identical to the Complainant's trademark, the disputed domain name was not in active use other than to connect to a GoDaddy parking page indicating that "*the domain is registered but may still be available*" and the WhoIs search gave no information as to the identity of the registrant. The Respondent's name was redacted. The Complainant had approached the Respondent through an intermediary in May 2026 with a view to acquiring the disputed domain name, but was told that the Respondent was looking for a six-figure sum.

However, following Registrar Verification the Center informed the Complainant on August 27, 2026 that the Respondent was an individual named Jake Arnold and provided the Complainant with the Respondent's address in Australia (a PO Box), his email address and his Australian telephone number. The Center invited the Complainant to amend the Complaint to add the newly identified registrant as a respondent and went on to state "*You may also wish to include further facts or arguments in light of the new registrant information*."

Thus, the Complainant had the opportunity of reviewing the original Complaint to see how this new information impacted it and to bolster it as necessary. The Respondent's email address (via the Respondent's domain name in that address) gave the Complainant a very simple method of learning more about the Respondent. As my colleagues observe, the Complainant is represented by an experienced counsel and that represented parties are often held to a higher standard when addressing RDNH. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.16. The homepage on the Complainant's representative counsel's website cites four areas of speciality one of which is a paragraph headed "Strategic IP" reading:

"Create the protection you need for business-critical assets and defend them when it counts. As one of the largest and most highly regarded transatlantic IP practices, we bring unmatched depth, experience and creativity to every IP matter."

With that level of support the Complainant must have been advised that the original Complaint had no chance of success unless it was boosted by evidence to show at the very least that in 2015 when the disputed domain name was registered the Respondent was likely to have been aware of the existence of the Complainant. The Complainant would also have been advised that bare unsupported assertions are not enough. Allegations of bad faith must be supported by the best evidence a complainant can readily muster.

On reviewing the Complaint and having Australia as the key area to address and seeing that the supporting evidence as to reputation and goodwill back in 2015 goes no further than the United States, the Complainant would have realised that its principal allegations were unsupported, resting solely on bare assertions - bare assertions, such as:

"*The ROBLOX Mark is a famous and well-known mark that enjoys a substantial and longstanding global reputation."*

"*The Domain Name was created on 22 May 2015 and last updated on 27 April 2026. By both dates, the ROBLOX Mark had long been established as a well-known and famous mark, with the Complainant having operated the ROBLOX platform since 2006 and having built up an extensive portfolio of trade mark registrations across multiple jurisdictions worldwide.*"

"*The Complainant is the owner of the famous ROBLOX Mark, which has been in continuous use since 2006 and is recognised worldwide.*"

"*Given the exceptional fame and global reputation of the ROBLOX Mark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights in the ROBLOX Mark at the time of registering the Domain Name. The Respondent must have had actual knowledge of the ROBLOX Mark at the time of registration.*"

To make good those assertions with Australia in mind the Complainant must have been advised to produce its 2015 sales and marketing figures for Australia along with any press/third party coverage in support of its

claim quoted above that "*The Respondent must have had actual knowledge of the ROBLOX Mark at the time of registration*."

It seems probable to me that the Complainant had no evidence to support that claim and, if so, ought to have withdrawn the Complaint, but it did not do so. It amended the Complaint by including the Respondent's name and Australian address and resubmitted the Complaint five days later on September 1, 2026 in its amended form certifying that the information in the amended Complaint was to the best of the Complainant's knowledge complete and accurate. I have compared the sections of both versions of the Complaint headed "VI. Factual and Legal Grounds" and they are identical. The amended Complaint contains nothing that was not in the original Complaint. No attempt was made justify the unsupported claims to a global reputation and goodwill in 2015.

It seems to me that there are two possible explanations for the Complainant's failure to bolster the Complaint with evidence to support its claim that the Respondent must have registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, namely (1) It searched for the necessary evidence and found that there was none – the Complainant's fame and goodwill had not reached Australia by 2015; (2) It could not be bothered to go to the trouble and expense of investigating further. Either way, for me, to plough ahead with allegations of bad faith (necessarily allegations of dishonesty) against a potentially innocent registrant is indefensible. As the distinguished panel in *Nalli Chinnasami Chetty v. Anthony Nalli, FourPoints Multimedia Corp* WIPO Case No. D2019-2642 stated:

"The conduct in this case falls under the category of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. Once the privacy shield was lifted through the Registrar Verification, the Complainant and its counsel knew that they could not possibly succeed on any fair interpretation of the facts in this case. By filing an amended Complaint and repeating the same arguments that were in the initial Complaint, the Complainant and its counsel abused the WIPO administrative process in an attempt to obtain the disputed domain despite the inconvenient fact that the Respondent was Mr. Nalli. Rather than address that point, the Complainant and its counsel simply repeated the same arguments, baldly asserting that Mr. Nalli could have no plausible reason for registering the disputed domain name <nalligroup.com> other than to usurp the Complainant's goodwill. The Complaint was therefore completely devoid of any facts or arguments that could support a finding that the Respondent lacked rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant and its counsel also provided no evidentiary support whatsoever to support their argument that the Respondent must have registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. As such, they completely ignored the requirements set out in the Policy for establishing bad faith registration and use of a domain name. The Complainant and its counsel ignored the potential legitimate reasons as to why the Respondent may have registered the disputed domain name, disregarded precedent and unfavorable facts in concluding that the webpage (which makes no connection whatsoever to the Complainant) was an attempt to misappropriate its trademark reputation, and offered no more than unsupported allegations."

As such, the Panel finds the Complainant guilty of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking."

That case was a more extreme case than this one but the fact remains that in this case the Complainant, represented by an IP specialist, had the procedural opportunity to rectify the gaping hole in its case, which materialised when it learnt that the Respondent was in Australia while its evidence of reputation and goodwill in 2015 was limited to the United States. It elected not to do so.

Section 4.16 of WIPO Overview 3.1 sets out a selection of reasons articulated by panels for finding RDNH including:

(i) facts which demonstrate that the complainant knew it could not succeed as to any of the required three elements;

On a fair view of the facts in this case and apparent to the Complainant prior to the filing of the amended Complaint the Complainant must have known that there was a very strong chance of the Complaint failing under the third element for the lack of evidence to demonstrate that the Respondent must have known of the existence of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name in 2015.

(ii) facts which demonstrate that the complainant clearly ought to have known it could not succeed under any fair interpretation of facts reasonably available prior to the filing of the complaint;

If the Complainant was not aware of this significant weakness in its case that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, it ought to have been so aware having the benefit of its representative who is a specialist in the field.

(iii) unreasonably ignoring established Policy precedent notably as captured in this WIPO Overview;

Anyone such as the Complainant's representative, familiar with WIPO Overview 3.1, will have been well aware that bare assertions of bad faith unsupported by evidence are insufficient. Supporting evidence is crucial when levelling allegations of dishonesty. The evidence (if any) as to the Complainant's reputation and goodwill in Australia back in 2015 is all in the hands of the Complainant. None of it appeared in the amended Complaint. As indicated above, I infer that it is non-existent.

(iv) filing the complaint after an unsuccessful attempt to acquire the disputed domain name from the respondent without a plausible legal basis.

The Complainant used its approach to the Respondent in May 2026 and the Respondent's indication that he was looking for a six-figure sum as the basis for its allegation that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant with intent to exploit the identity of the ROBLOX trademark for financial gain at the Complainant's expense. To succeed with those allegations the Complainant must have known that it would need to make good its unsupported claim that at the relevant time in 2015 the Respondent must have been aware of the existence of the Complainant. It chose not to do so but persisted with the Complaint.

(v) basing a complaint on only the barest of allegations without any supporting evidence.

The key to all the Complainant's allegations of bad faith registration of the disputed domain name depended upon the Complainant being able to make good the unsupported claims as to the extent of its reputation and goodwill in 2015. The evidence in relation to the United States was evidence of substance. Evidence beyond the United States was non-existent.

The evidence supporting the allegation of bad faith use of the disputed domain name subsequent to registration comprised nothing more than the size of the figure put upon the disputed domain name by the Respondent. In the absence of evidence to support the contention that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Respondent in mind and in the absence of anything else to show that the Respondent was acting in bad faith, a seller of a domain name is free to price it as he wishes. By May 2026 the Respondent may well have been aware of the identity of the Complainant.

In my view the behaviour of the Complainant in pursuing its bad faith allegations unchanged despite the knowledge it acquired following Registrar Verification, demonstrates at best a regrettably cavalier approach to the matter. Falsely accusing someone of dishonesty of this kind without any (not even the barest) evidence to support the allegations and having had an opportunity of either withdrawing the Complaint or addressing the issue with further evidence in the amended Complaint constitutes RDNH.
Tony Willoughby

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied and no finding of RDNH is made.

/Jeremy Speres/
Jeremy Speres
Presiding Panelist

/Jeffrey M. Samuels/
Jeffrey M. Samuels
Panelist

/Tony Willoughby/
Tony Willoughby
Panelist
Date: November 5, 2026