

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

International Business Machines Corporation v. Carolina Rodrigues,
Fundacion Comercio Electronico

Case No. D2023-2239

1. The Parties

The Complainant is International Business Machines Corporation, United States of America (“US”), represented internally.

The Respondent is Carolina Rodrigues, Fundacion Comercio Electronico, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <power11ibm.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 23, 2023. On May 24, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 25, 2023, 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 (John Doe) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 26, 2023, 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 June 6, 2023.

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”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 8, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 28, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 29, 2023.

The Center appointed Tuukka Airaksinen as the sole panelist in this matter on July 4, 2023. 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 has been using the trademark IBM since 1924 in the field of information technology. The Complainant's trademark has been registered in various countries, such as in the US, under number 4181289 since July 31, 2012.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 23, 2022. The record shows that it resolved to a website that triggered a security alert, and later resolved to a pay-per-click ("PPC") site offering links to third-party technology websites.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's trademark in its entirety combined with the word "power", and the number 11, which renders the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise allowed the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a *bona fide* offering of goods and services nor is there any evidence of fair noncommercial use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's trademark is world-famous. The disputed domain name resolved to a website that showed elements consistent with malware or virus distribution, and later resolved to a PPC website offering links to third-party technology websites. The disputed domain name was listed for sale on a Registrar parked site, for the sum of USD 1,299.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to obtain the transfer of a domain name, a complainant must prove the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, regardless of whether the respondent files a response to the complaint or not. The first element is that the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights. The second element a complainant must prove is that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name. The third element a complainant must establish is that the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. Consequently, the Complainant must prove that it has rights to a trademark, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to this trademark.

According to section 1.11 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), “[t]he applicable Top Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name (e.g., ‘.com’, ‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test”.

Furthermore, “where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements”. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark as it includes the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety combined with the term “power” and the number 11. These additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name.

This means that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and hence the first element of the Policy has been fulfilled.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain name.

It is widely accepted among UDRP panels that once a complainant has made a *prima facie* showing indicating the absence of the respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence of such rights or legitimate interests.

If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy. See, e.g., *Document Technologies, Inc. v. International Electronic Communications Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0270](#); and section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Complainant has credibly submitted that the Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant in any way nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use and register the disputed domain name, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has not made and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant’s trademark. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Furthermore, Panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a *bona fide* offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a *prima facie* case that has not been rebutted by the Respondent. Considering the Panel’s findings below, the Panel finds that there are no other circumstances that provide the Respondent with any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy is fulfilled.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

“(i) circumstances indicating that [the respondent has] registered or has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [the respondent’s] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [the respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business or competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] website or location.”

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that its trademark is well-known all over the world. Considering that the Complainant has been using and registering its trademark for several decades before the disputed domain name was registered and taking into account the activity to which the disputed domain name has been put, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The disputed domain name resolved to a website that triggered a security alert, and then to a PPC website containing links to other websites offering goods and services competing with those of the Complainant, thus generating an undue association, and potential revenue on the Complainant’s trademark. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source of the products or services on the Respondent’s website.

Given the circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has also been offered for sale for a valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent’s probable registration costs of the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy is fulfilled.

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, <power1ibm.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tuukka Airaksinen/

Tuukka Airaksinen

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2023