

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Databricks, Inc. v. Name Redacted

Case No. DNU2026-0002

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Databricks, Inc., United States of America (the “United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <databricks.nu> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Loopia AB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 7, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 10, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 10, 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 July 15, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

¹The Respondent appears to have used the name and/or contact details of a third party when registering the Domain Name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Domain Name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 5, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center received an email from a third party.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on August 19, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant provides cloud-based data engineering, data science, machine learning and analytics solutions to enterprises. It was founded in 2013 and serves today thousands of enterprise customers across more than 100 countries.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in DATABRICKS, e.g. European Union registration No. 012694394 (registered July 16, 2014).

The Respondent registered the Domain Name on March 11, 2026. The Complainant has documented that the Domain Name has been used to impersonate the Complainant in email communications, to submit a fraudulent purchase order and to extract goods from a third-party vendor by deception. At the time of the Decision, the Domain Name resolved to an error website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that the Complainant's trademark is well-known. The Complainant asserts that the Domain Name is confusingly similar or identical to the Complainant's trademark. The addition of the country code top-level domain ".nu" does not serve to distinguish the Domain Name from the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has ever used or made preparations to use the Domain Name in connection with a legitimate business, or that it has otherwise been known by the Domain Name. The Domain Name has been used to impersonate the Complainant two days after the Domain Name was registered. Such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

The Complainant argues that the Domain Name was registered in bad faith with the aim to target the Complainant. This follows from the Complainant's prior trademark rights and reputation in the market, as well as the Respondent's fraudulent use of the Domain Name just a few days after registration. The same use, impersonation and fraud, is evidence of bad faith use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, the Center received an email from a third party stating that its name and contact details had been used to register the Domain Name without its knowledge or authorization.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the domain name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in DATABRICKS. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark, and the Panel finds that the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. For the purpose of assessing whether a domain name is confusingly similar or identical under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD"). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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. While the overall burden of proof in UDRP 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's 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. On the contrary, the use of the Domain Name, as described above, is evidence of bad faith.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has 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.

The composition and use of the Domain Name prove that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its prior rights when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The use of the Domain Name is also evidence of bad faith use. The Respondent has used the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant to defraud the Complainant's customers. The Panel concludes that the Domain Name was registered and is used in bad faith. The bad faith is further supported by the Respondent's use of third party's contact details.

The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders the Domain Name <databricks.nu> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2026