

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

FUTO Holdings Inc. v. test account

Case No. DIO2026-0045

1. The Parties

The Complainant is FUTO Holdings Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Law Office of Andrei D. Popovici, P.C., United States.

The Respondent is test account, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <immich.io> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Cloudflare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 2, 2026. On September 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 8, 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 (REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 8, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 8, 2026.

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 September 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2026. On September 16, 2026, the Complainant filed a Supplemental Filing. On the same day, the Response was filed with the Center. The Center acknowledged receipt of the Supplemental Filing on September 18, 2026, and informed the Parties that its admissibility would be a matter for the Panel.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a corporation organised under the laws of the State of Delaware, with an address in Austin, Texas, United States. It describes itself as an organisation that develops technologies, both through in-house engineering and investment, intended to promote “tech freedom” and to counter centralisation in the technology industry.

One of the Complainant’s projects is Immich, a self-hosted photo and video management application. Immich was launched on GitHub as an open-source project in 2022. Its source code is distributed under the GNU Affero General Public License (“AGPL”). Immich mobile applications are available from the Google Play Store and the Apple App Store, and the official Immich website has been available at <immich.app> since June 2022. The Complainant has filed evidence of the download and usage figures for the Immich mobile applications, of user ratings and reviews, and of online articles commenting on the Immich application.

The Respondent asserts, and the Complainant does not dispute, that the Complainant acquired the Immich project and its associated brand after the Disputed Domain Name was registered. The Complainant’s position, as expressed by its counsel in correspondence, is that its rights “trace back to the beginning of the Immich project in early 2022”.

The Complainant owns United States Trademark Registration No. 7,678,695 for the word mark IMMICH, filed on May 4, 2024, and registered on February 4, 2025, in classes 9 and 42, which claims a date of first use in commerce of February 6, 2022. It also owns International Trademark Registration No. 1839281 for the word mark IMMICH, registered on January 11, 2025, designating, among other territories, the European Union, the United Kingdom, China, Japan, and Canada, in each of which protection has been granted. These registrations are referred to in this decision as the “IMMICH trademark”.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 6, 2023. The registrant details disclosed by the Registrar give the registrant’s name as “test account” and its address as “ui ui”, postal code “1111AB”, Netherlands (Kingdom of the). The Respondent has corresponded with the Complainant’s counsel and with the Center from a Gmail address under the display name “demo”, and refers to itself variously as “I”, “we” and “our team”. It has not otherwise identified itself. The filed Response gives the name of the Respondent as “test account” which is manifestly not the true name of whoever the Respondent is.

According to the Complaint and the screenshots of the Disputed Domain Name annexed to it, reportedly taken on August 2, 2026, and September 2, 2026, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website (the “Respondent’s Website”) concerned with photo and video management, which included statements such as “Built on Immich, the world’s most-loved open photo app” and “Built on Immich — 100,000+ stars on GitHub”, together with links to the Complainant’s website at <immich.app>. The Respondent says that the Respondent’s Website offered assistance in setting up the Immich software, that it planned to sell hardware (which it says it had not yet sold), and that the Respondent’s Website referred to <immich.app> as “the open-source magic inside”.

On September 8, 2026, after being contacted by the Complainant’s counsel, the Respondent took the Respondent’s Website down. On September 9, 2026, the Disputed Domain Name did not resolve to any active website.

Between September 8 and September 16, 2026, the Complainant’s counsel and the Respondent exchanged a series of emails concerning a possible voluntary transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. In

the course of that exchange the Complainant's counsel invited the Respondent to make a "counterproposal" and indicated that reimbursement of the Respondent's registration fees would likely be acceptable. On September 10, 2026, the Respondent proposed a settlement payment of USD 450, which it said covered its out-of-pocket costs "including initial domain registration, annual renewal fees since December 2023, and basic administrative and setup expenses — as well as the effort to transfer the domain". The Complainant's counsel accepted that proposal the same day. On September 15, 2026, the Respondent stated that "[o]ur AI agent has actually sent an yearly [sic] cost of domain as total costs" and that the correct figure was three times that previously stated (which the Complainant's counsel understood as USD 1,350), and referred the Complainant's counsel to an automated GoDaddy appraisal valuing the Disputed Domain Name at USD 1,971. No settlement was concluded.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant's contentions may be summarised as follows.

The Disputed Domain Name is identical to the IMMICH trademark, the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".io" being disregarded for the purposes of comparison. IMMICH is an invented and fanciful term with no meaning other than as the Complainant's brand.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has never authorised the Respondent to use the IMMICH trademark, the Respondent owns no corresponding trademark, and Internet users searching for the Complainant's application are likely to arrive at the Respondent's Website.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent's Website offers goods and services in the same field as the Complainant (the management and hosting of images), expressly refers to Immich and links to the Complainant's website, and so misleads Internet users into believing that the Respondent's Website is authorised or endorsed by the Complainant, within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In its amendment to the Complaint the Complainant adds that the Respondent's provision of false registration details ("test account", "ui ui") is further evidence of bad faith.

In the Supplemental Filing the Complainant contends that the Respondent's conduct in the settlement correspondence provides further evidence of bad faith, in that the Respondent reneged on an agreed transfer for USD 450 and then sought USD 1,350, by reference to the appraised market value of the Disputed Domain Name, which is a sum in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs (see paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy). It also contends that the Respondent's removal of the Respondent's Website after notice of the dispute does not cure its bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent's contentions may be summarised as follows.

The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on December 6, 2023, at which time the Complainant held no registered trademark rights in IMMICH. The Complainant did not apply for its United States registration until May 4, 2024, or for its International Registration until January 11, 2025, and cannot retroactively claim exclusive rights in the name of an open-source project.

The Respondent has a legitimate interest under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Before notice of the dispute it made demonstrable preparations to offer hardware deployment, configuration and maintenance services for open-source software. The Immich software is distributed under the AGPL, which permits third parties to host, deploy and configure it. The Respondent's Website attributed the software to the open-source project and pointed visitors to <immich.app>. The Respondent never sold software licences

or impersonated the Complainant; in its words, the Respondent's Website "proudly shares that we have not built anything but use the open source tool only".

The Disputed Domain Name was not registered in bad faith, because the Respondent could not have targeted trademark rights that did not then exist. The Complainant's reliance on the settlement correspondence is misplaced: it was the Complainant's counsel who solicited a figure, the Respondent's initial proposal was a good faith calculation of its costs, and the Respondent transparently corrected a calculation error. The Complainant's counsel "baited" the Respondent into discussing figures in order to manufacture evidence of bad faith.

The Respondent requests a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking, on the basis that the Complainant knew its trademark was registered long after the Disputed Domain Name and has used the proceeding, and "aggressive settlement traps", to force an open-source deployment provider to surrender a domain name registered in good faith.

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary Matters - The applicable Policy

The Policy is closely modelled on the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), and the Panel considers that, where the language of the two is the same, it is appropriate to have regard to the body of UDRP decisions and to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"). There is, however, one material difference. Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP a complainant must show that the domain name "has been registered and is being used in bad faith". Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that the domain name "has been registered *or* is being used in bad faith" (emphasis added). The requirement is therefore disjunctive, and it is sufficient for the Complainant to establish either bad faith registration or bad faith use. The Panel notes that the introductory words of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy continue to refer to evidence of "the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith". The Panel does not consider that this wording, which appears to have been carried over from the UDRP, imports a cumulative requirement into paragraph 4(a)(iii), which is expressed in clear disjunctive terms; the circumstances in paragraph 4(b) are in any event non-exhaustive.

Preliminary Matters - Identity of the Respondent

The registrant name disclosed by the Registrar, "test account", is self-evidently not the name of a real person or entity, and the accompanying address is plainly fictitious. The person or persons who control the Disputed Domain Name have, however, received notice of this proceeding at the email address disclosed by the Registrar, have corresponded from it, and have filed a Response. The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent has had a full opportunity to participate in this proceeding, and refers to the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name, whoever that may be, as the Respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.4.

Preliminary Matters - The Supplemental Filing

Paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules give the Panel discretion as to the admissibility of unsolicited supplemental filings. Such filings are generally discouraged, and a party submitting one should show its relevance and why the material could not have been provided earlier. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.6. The Supplemental Filing concerns correspondence between the Parties which took place after the Complaint was filed and so could not have been included in it. It is relevant to issues the Panel has to decide. The Respondent filed its Response after receiving the Supplemental Filing, addressed the same correspondence in detail, and itself annexed the full email chain. No unfairness to either Party results from admitting it, and the Panel admits the Supplemental Filing. For the same reasons the Panel has also taken into account the Respondent's informal email communications.

Preliminary Matters - Settlement correspondence

Panels applying the UDRP tend to regard settlement discussions between the parties as admissible, particularly insofar as they may be relevant to the parties' respective motivations, while recognising that such negotiations can serve a legitimate purpose and are not necessarily indicative of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.10. Both Parties have relied on the correspondence and the Panel has considered it. The weight it bears is addressed below.

Substantive Matters

To succeed, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has rights in the IMMICH trademark by virtue of the registrations referred to above. Registered trademark rights of this kind prima facie satisfy the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for the purposes of standing. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Respondent's argument that the Complainant held no registered rights when the Disputed Domain Name was registered is not relevant to this element. The first element is a standing requirement, and the relevant trademark rights need only exist at the time the complaint is filed. The fact that a domain name may have been registered before a complainant acquired its trademark rights does not by itself preclude a finding of identity or confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3. The timing of the Respondent's registration falls instead to be considered under the third element.

The Disputed Domain Name consists of the IMMICH trademark in its entirety, with no addition. It is well established that the ccTLD, here ".io", is a standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded for the purposes of the first element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. The Disputed Domain Name is therefore identical to the IMMICH trademark.

Accordingly the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and the first condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if proved, demonstrate a respondent's rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, namely: (i) before any notice of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; (ii) being commonly known by the domain name, even without having acquired trademark rights; or (iii) making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark at issue.

The Complainant has not authorised, licensed or permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or to use the IMMICH trademark. The Complainant has therefore established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, and the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to produce relevant evidence demonstrating rights

or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1, and *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

There is no suggestion that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, and paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy does not apply. On the contrary, the Respondent has concealed its identity behind a fictitious name and address. Nor is the Respondent's use noncommercial or fair: on its own account the Respondent's Website was directed to the offering of deployment and configuration services and, prospectively, hardware. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy therefore does not assist it. The Respondent's case rests on paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. In substance it says that it is a service provider in relation to open-source software which it is entitled to use, and that its use of the Immich name was merely referential. The Panel does not accept that case, for the following reasons.

First, the fact that the Immich software is distributed under the AGPL does not assist the Respondent. An open-source licence of that kind grants permission, subject to its terms, to use, modify and distribute the licensed software under copyright. It does not of itself grant any licence to use the name of the project as a trademark, still less to register that name, without addition, as a domain name. The Respondent's ability lawfully to deploy and configure the Immich software for its customers is not in issue; what is in issue is its adoption of the IMMICH trademark as the entirety of its domain name.

Second, panels have recognised that resellers, distributors or service providers using a domain name containing a complainant's trademark to undertake sales or services relating to the complainant's goods or services may in some circumstances be making a bona fide offering, subject to the cumulative requirements set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) (the "Oki Data test"). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1. Those requirements include that the website must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder. However, cases applying the Oki Data test usually involve a domain name comprising a trademark plus a descriptive term, and the risk of impersonation has led panels to find that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests where, as here, the domain name is identical to the complainant's trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.1 and 2.8.2. A domain name identical to a trademark carries a high risk of implied affiliation, because it effectively presents itself as the domain name of the trademark owner.

That risk is particularly acute in the present case. "Immich" is a coined term with no meaning other than as the name of the Complainant's software. The ".io" ccTLD is, as a matter of general knowledge, widely used by software and technology businesses and projects. An Internet user encountering <immich.io> would, in the Panel's view, naturally assume that it was an official domain name of the Immich project. The Disputed Domain Name does nothing to distinguish the Respondent from the Complainant; it simply appropriates the Complainant's identity.

Third, even on the Respondent's own description of the Respondent's Website, it did not accurately and prominently disclose the absence of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. Statements such as "Built on Immich, the world's most-loved open photo app", references to the project's popularity on GitHub, and a description of <immich.app> as "the open-source magic inside" tell the visitor that the product incorporates the Immich software. The Respondent's Website does not inform the visitor that the operator is unconnected with the Immich project or the Complainant; if anything, the website reinforces an association with the Complainant. It is, moreover, difficult to see how a website could accurately disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark owner when the registrant has deliberately concealed who it is.

Fourth, the Respondent had no need to use the IMMICH trademark as its domain name in order to offer its services. A provider of deployment or hardware services for Immich could readily identify its business by its own name, and could refer to the Immich software, in an appropriately referential way, in the content of its website. What it may not legitimately do is to present itself, through the domain name, as Immich.

In these circumstances the Panel does not need to determine whether the Respondent was in fact actually offering any goods or services, as opposed to planning to do so, before notice of the dispute. Even assuming in its favour that it was, the Panel does not consider that such an offering, made by means of a domain name identical to the Complainant's coined trademark, was bona fide for the purposes of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Accordingly the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Used in Bad Faith

As noted above, under the Policy it is sufficient for the Complainant to establish that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered in bad faith or is being used in bad faith. The Panel considers first the question of use.

Use in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that it is evidence of bad faith where, by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on it.

The Panel is satisfied that this is what the Respondent has done. The Respondent plainly knew of the Immich software and its name; its entire proposition was built around that software. It used a domain name identical to a coined trademark, under a ccTLD associated with the technology sector, for a commercial website promoting products and services based on the Complainant's software, and which traded on the reputation of the Immich project by reference to its popularity. Internet users looking for the Immich project, and typing or seeing <immich.io>, would be drawn to the Respondent's Website by the assumption that it was an official Immich site. That is precisely the confusion as to source, sponsorship or affiliation which paragraph 4(b)(iv) addresses. See also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4, which notes that the mere registration of a domain name identical to a trademark, particularly a coined or fanciful mark, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

The Panel has considered the Respondent's contention that the Respondent's Website attributed the software to the open-source project and linked to <immich.app>. That does not alter the Panel's conclusion. Where the overall circumstances point to bad faith, the existence of a disclaimer or attribution cannot cure it. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.7. Here the confusion is generated by the Disputed Domain Name itself, and arises before the visitor has read anything on the Respondent's Website. For the reasons already given, the content of the Respondent's Website did not in any event dispel the impression of an association with the Complainant.

The fact that the Respondent removed the Respondent's Website on September 8, 2026, after the Complainant's counsel had contacted it, does not assist the Respondent. The Policy is concerned with whether the Disputed Domain Name "is being used" in bad faith, and that assessment is not defeated by a respondent ceasing an abusive use once a complaint has been filed. The Respondent continues to hold a domain name identical to the Complainant's coined trademark, and having regard to the distinctiveness of that trademark, the Respondent's previous use, and its use of false contact details, the Panel cannot conceive of any plausible good faith use to which the Respondent could put it. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3, and *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#).

The Panel is reinforced in its view by the fact that the registrant name and address provided to the Registrar are clearly false. Panels view the provision of false contact information as an indication of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6, and *Salomon Smith Barney Inc. v. Salomon Internet Services*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0668](#). The Panel regards this as a corroborative factor, rather than an

independent ground, but it is not consistent with the operation of a genuine business offering services to the public under the Disputed Domain Name.

Settlement correspondence. The Panel does not consider it necessary to rely on the settlement correspondence in reaching its conclusion, and has approached it with some caution. It was the Complainant's counsel who invited the Respondent to put forward a figure, and the Panel does not regard a respondent's response to such an invitation as evidence of bad faith in itself. The initial figure of USD 450 was not, on its face, grossly disproportionate to the Respondent's likely registration costs together with the cost of effecting a transfer. The Panel is equally not persuaded by the Respondent's characterisation of the correspondence as an attempt to "entrap" it; a request by a trademark owner's counsel for a counterproposal is an unremarkable feature of settlement negotiations. The Panel would, however, observe that the Respondent's subsequent withdrawal from an agreed figure, coupled with its reference to an appraisal of the Disputed Domain Name's market value, sits uneasily with its claim that it sought no more than reimbursement of its costs. Any value of the Disputed Domain Name beyond the Respondent's costs derives from its correspondence with the Complainant's trademark. To that limited extent the correspondence is consistent with, rather than contrary to, the Panel's conclusion; it is not, however, the basis for it.

The Panel therefore finds that the Disputed Domain Name is being used in bad faith.

Registration in Bad Faith

Given the disjunctive nature of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Panel does not need to determine whether the Disputed Domain Name was also registered in bad faith. It is, however, appropriate to address the Respondent's principal argument, which is that it could not have registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith because the Complainant held no registered trademark at that time.

That argument is misconceived. The relevant question is not whether a trademark registration then existed, but whether the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with the Immich project and its name in mind, with a view to taking unfair advantage of it. By December 6, 2023, Immich had been publicly available as an open-source project for well over a year, and the official website at <immich.app> had been in use since June 2022. "Immich" is a coined term which no one would be likely to adopt except by reference to that project, and the Respondent offers no other explanation for its choice; on its own account, it chose the name because its intended business was built around the Immich software. The Panel also notes that, under the ioDRP, unregistered trademark rights may suffice and that such rights can be established in respect of a distinctive name that has acquired recognition within a specialised field. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3, and *Imperial College v. Christophe Dessimoz*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0322](#).

The Panel recognises that the position at the date of registration is complicated by the fact that the Complainant appears to have acquired the Immich project and brand only after that date, and the evidence as to the accrual and ownership of any unregistered rights at that time is limited. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8. The Panel is inclined to the view that the Respondent's deliberate appropriation of the name of an existing and popular project, in identical form, for a commercial purpose built around that project, would amount to registration in bad faith irrespective of who then owned the goodwill in the name. However, in light of its finding as to use, the Panel does not need to, and does not, reach a concluded view on that question.

Accordingly the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is being used in bad faith and the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Respondent has requested a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. 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 Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or was brought primarily 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. See also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

As the Complaint has succeeded, no such finding is appropriate. The Panel would add that it sees nothing improper in the Complainant's conduct. The Complainant had registered rights in a coined trademark which the Respondent had appropriated in identical form, and the Complaint was properly brought. The Complainant's counsel was entitled to explore a negotiated transfer, and the Panel does not accept that the settlement correspondence discloses any "trap" or other abuse of the proceeding. The request is refused.

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 <immich.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nick J. Gardner/

Nick J. Gardner

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026