

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Everest Reinsurance Company v. John van der Ceecee
Case No. DNL2026-0018

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Everest Reinsurance Company, United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The registrant of the disputed domain name is John van der Ceecee, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), (the "Respondent").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <everestglobal.nl> is registered with SIDN through Namecheap, Inc.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 1, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to SIDN a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name.

On May 4, 2026, SIDN transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details of the Respondent.

In accordance with the Regulations, articles 5.1 and 16.4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint and the proceedings commenced on May 5, 2026. In accordance with the Regulations, article 7.1, the due date for Response was May 25, 2026. The Center did not receive any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard C.K. van Oerle as the panelist in this matter on May 29, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panelist has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required to ensure compliance with the Regulations, article 9.2.

4. Factual Background

The following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant was founded in 1973 as the Reinsurance arm of Prudential Financial and is a subsidiary of Everest Group Ltd., a global reinsurance and insurance organization. In 1996, it officially adopted the name “Everest”. On July 10, 2023, Everest Re Group, Ltd. Changed its name to Everest Group, Ltd. The Complainant has (via subsidiaries) offices worldwide, including in the Netherlands (Kingdom of).

Relevant to this matter, the Complainant owns, inter alia, the following trademark registrations:

- EVEREST GLOBAL, European Union Trademark Registration, registration No. 018804098, registered on March 28, 2023; and
- EVEREST, European Union Trademark Registration, registration No 000417675, registered on January 20, 1999.

These registrations are valid. The registrations will jointly be referred to, in singular, as the “Trademark”.

The Complainant owns the domain name <everestglobal.com>, registered on May 12, 2000, and has used it as its primary domain name since.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 6, 2025, and was used to redirect to the Complainant’s website at <everestglobal.com>. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that directs to a blank page and lacks content. The Complainant has also provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used for sending emails.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Regulations for it to become the registrant of the disputed domain name instead of the Respondent.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

The disputed domain name consists solely of the Complainant’s Trademark, resulting in a domain name that is identical to the Complainant’s EVEREST GLOBAL trademark and thus meeting the requirements under 2.1 (a) of the Regulations.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant’s Trademark in any manner, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, as reflected in the available registration records. It alleges that the disputed domain name was used to redirect users to the Complainant’s website and to send emails that appeared to originate from the Complainant, thereby creating a false impression of authorization. Specifically, email communications were sent from an email address incorporating the disputed domain name with the sender being identified as “Everest Global”.

The Complainant characterizes this conduct as impersonation and a potential phishing scheme rather than a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use. It further notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive webpage, which, in its view, provides no evidence of any legitimate use.

Finally, the Complainant emphasizes that the disputed domain name was registered in June 2025, long after the Complainant's Trademark registrations, claimed first use of the Trademark in commerce, and registration of its primary domain name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. It contends that its Trademark is well known internationally and has been in use since 1996, long before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2025. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is identical to its Trademark and closely mirrors its primary domain name, making it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further alleges that the disputed domain name was first redirected to the Complainant's official website to create an appearance of legitimacy and was then used to send emails from an address associated with the disputed domain name that purported to originate from the Complainant. The Complainant characterizes this conduct as a phishing scheme aimed at obtaining personal or financial information and submits that such impersonation and fraudulent use are clear indicators of bad faith.

The Complainant further notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website. It argues that, given the lack of any legitimate use, the prior alleged phishing activity, and the incorporation of the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety, there is no plausible good-faith reason for the Respondent's registration or use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also points to the Respondent's use of a privacy service to conceal its identity as an additional factor supporting a finding of bad faith.

Overall, the Complainant submits that the evidence shows that the Respondent was aware of and specifically targeted the Complainant's Trademark and therefore registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Language of the Proceedings

According to article 17.1 of the Regulations, "Proceedings shall be conducted in the Dutch language whenever both the complainant and the respondent are residing or registered in the Netherlands. In exceptional circumstances however, the Center (subject to the panelist's determination) or the panelist may decide that proceedings are to be conducted in English, or that the complainant or the respondent may make submissions in English".

In this regard, the Panel notes the Complainant has indicated in the Complaint its address to be in the United States of America.

The Panel therefore decides that the proceedings be conducted in English.

6.2 Discussion and Findings on the Merits

Pursuant to article 2.1 of the Regulations, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

a) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to:

l) a trademark or trade name protected under Dutch law in which the Complainant has rights; or

II) a personal name registered in the General Municipal Register (Gemeentelijke Basisadministratie) of a municipality in the Netherlands, or the name of a Dutch public legal entity or the name of an association or foundation registered in the Netherlands under which the Complainant undertakes public activities on a permanent basis; and

b) the Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and

c) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent did not provide a response to the Complaint. Therefore, based on article 10.3 of the Regulations, the Panel decides on the dispute on the basis of the Complaint. In that case, the Complaint shall be granted, unless the Panel considers it to be without basis in law or in fact.

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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the EVEREST GLOBAL trademark for the purposes of the Regulations.

The entirety of the EVEREST GLOBAL trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the EVEREST GLOBAL trademark for the purposes of the Regulations.

The Panel finds the first element of the Regulations has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Article 3.1 of the Regulations 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 in .NL proceedings 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 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel, also taking into account that the Respondent has not submitted a Response, finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, passing off and potential phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The Panel also finds that the use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's website is not considered as indicative of any rights or legitimate interests on behalf of the Respondent, and rather supports a finding that the Respondent was deliberately attempting to create the impression that the disputed domain name was connected to, or affiliated with, to the Complainant.

The Panel finds the second element of the Regulations has been established.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

In light of its considerations under Section 6.B, the undisputed allegations presented by the Complainant, and the lack of a response by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and/or is used in bad faith.

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph Article 2.1(c) of the Regulations, Article 3.2 of the Regulations establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration or use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)")¹ states that "the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain name comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith".

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Trademark is a worldwide well-known trademark. On top of that the disputed domain name is identical to the EVEREST GLOBAL trademark and to the Complainant's primary domain name, both registered several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, which suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its Trademark. Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Respondent has registered a domain name that is identical to the EVEREST GLOBAL trademark. The disputed domain name was redirected to <everestglobal.com>, the primary domain of the Complainant. The Complainant has demonstrated that the Respondent actually used the disputed domain name to send email communications, indicating the sender to be "Everest Global", despite being unrelated to the Complainant, based on the available record. In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name to mislead third parties into believing that it is associated with the Complainant, in an attempt to exploit such confusion, potentially through phishing, which is indicative of bad faith.

At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name no longer redirected to the Complainant's website, but resolved to a website that resolves to a blank page and lacks content. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panelists have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the UDRP Policy, and in the present case, for the purposes of the Regulations. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's Trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name identical to Complainant's prior Trademark and domain name, the prior redirection to the Complainant's website and the use for email communications, seemingly impersonating the Complainant, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Regulations.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration or use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Regulations.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Regulations.

¹ In view of the fact that the Regulations are substantially similar to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), it is well established that both cases decided under the Regulations and cases decided under the UDRP, and therefore [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), may be relevant to the determination of this proceeding (see, e.g., *Aktiebolaget Electrolux v. Beuk Horeca B.V.*, WIPO Case No. [DNL2008-0050](#)).

7. Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with articles 1 and 14 of the Regulations, the Panel orders that the Complainant becomes the registrant of the disputed domain name <everestglobal.nl> instead of the Respondent.

/Richard C.K. van Oerle/

Richard C.K. van Oerle

Panelist

Date: June 11, 2026