Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-106795

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-106795**
Time of filing	**2024-08-15 12:33:01**
Domain names	**einiride.tech, einride-tech.com, einirde.tech**

Case administrator

Name	**Olga Slanařová (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization	**Einride AB**

Complainant representative

Organization	**SILKA AB**

Respondents

Name	**Joanna Drochuck**
Name	**paul obi**

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant seeks to rely on the following registered trademarks:

Mark	Owner	Territory	Registration No.	Registration Date	Classes
EINRIDE	Einride AB	Sweden	535582	Nov. 04, 2016	7, 12, 20, 35, 39

EINRIDE	Einride AB	European Union	017417908	Feb, 25, 2018	7, 9, 12, 20, 35, 39, 42
EINRIDE	Einride AB	United Kingdom	UK00917417908	Feb 25, 2018	7, 9, 12, 20, 35, 39, 42
EINRIDE	Einride AB	United States of America	5,865,326	Sept. 24, 2019	9, 12, 39, 42
EINRIDE [with design elements]	Einride AB	IR (AE - AU - CA - CH - CN - MY - NO - SG - TH – US)	1596452	Mar. 04, 2021	9, 12, 35, 39, 42
EINRIDE [with design elements]	Einride AB	United States of America	6,841,374	Sept. 13, 2022	9, 12, 35, 39, 42
EINRIDE	Einride AB	IR (AE - AU - CA - CH - CN - GB - MY - NO - SG - TH - US)	1722096	Dec. 2, 2022	6, 9, 12, 19, 20, 25, 28, 35, 37, 38, 39, 42

Further, the Complainant operates its EINRIDE related business using the domain name <einride.tech> registered since 2018.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

Key aspects of the Complainant's contentions are summarized below.

Complainant's Background

The Complainant, established in 2016 and based in Stockholm, Sweden, specializes in electric and self-driving vehicles. As a global leader in digital, electric, and autonomous freight mobility technology, the Complainant operates in Sweden, Norway, Germany, the Benelux region, the UK, and the US. Since 2018, it has consistently promoted its services and industry insights through its website <einride.tech>.

With substantial recognition in the autonomous vehicle industry, the Complainant has appeared in at least several third-party rankings of top self-driving truck companies. The Complainant also maintains a strong social media presence, boasting over 300,000 followers on Facebook, more than 50,000 on LinkedIn, and thousands more across Instagram, X (formerly Twitter), and YouTube.

Registration of the disputed domain names

According to the registrar verification included with the Complaint, the disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

<einirde.tech>	May 20, 2024
<einiride.tech>	June 1, 2024
<einride-tech.com>	June 1, 2024

Phishing Emails

On June 3 , 2024, an email originating from [redacted]@einiride.tech was sent, purporting to be from the Complainant's Head of Corporate Finance and including the following text excerpt:

> "(…) Thanks for your response. We now have a new bank account for USD funding IFX payment. Due to a fx crisis in Sweden, we will provide you with our Global USD bank details for the $5m deposit. Please send the signed Subscription Agreement, then I will share the bank details for funding.
>
> Looking forward to your reply.
>
> Many thanks,
> [redacted]"

On July 2, 2024, an email originating from [redacted]@einride-tech.com was sent, falsely claiming to be from the Complainant's Corporate Finance department. The email was replied to by an internet user on the same day, leading to several conversations exchanged in July 02 and 03. These emails aimed to divert payments to accounts presumably controlled by the Respondent.

Cease and Desist Letter

When the Complainant became aware of the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names, they instructed their representative to send the Respondent a cease-and-desist letter to notify them of the infringement of the Complainant's trademark rights, requesting the immediate cease of any use and the transfer of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, a cease and desist letter was sent on June 3, 2024, to the registrant of <einirde.tech> via a contact form, however, the Respondent failed to respond to this correspondence.

Consolidation Request

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names should be consolidated into a single complaint because they are subject to common control for the following reasons:

- Two of the disputed domain names (<einirde.tech> and <einiride.tech>) are typosquatting variations of the Complainant's EINRIDE mark and official website.
- All three disputed domain names were registered within a short time frame, with only 12 days between the registration of <einirde.tech> and <einiride.tech>.
- All three disputed domain names were registered with the same registrar, PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com.
- All three disputed domain names had MX records, and at least two were used for phishing emails. <einiride.tech> and <einride.tech.com> have been suspended by the Registrar and as such no longer have active MX records.
- The registrant identities appear to have false addresses, such as "30 varren" in Warsaw, New York, and "N0 13b Berlin close" in Berlin, Germany, which do not correspond to valid postal addresses.

First UDRP Element - disputed domain name is Confusingly Similar to the Complainant's Trademark

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its EINRIDE trademark. The Complainant notes that, <einirde.tech> and <einiride.tech> represent misspelled, typosquatting variants of the EINRIDE mark, while <einride-tech.com> incorporates the Complainant's EINRIDE mark in its entirety, merely followed by '-tech'. From a side-by-side comparison, Complainant asserts that its EINRIDE mark remains distinctly recognizable in all of the domain names.

Further, the Complainant contends that the addition of the gTLD ".tech" and ".com" is merely instrumental to use in the Internet and does not affect the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names to the Complainant's trademarks.

Second UDRP Element – The Respondent has no Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain names

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent, or related in any way to the Complainant, nor is authorized in any way to use the Complainant's trademarks or to register or use the disputed domain names.

The Complainant also claims that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names as an individual, business, or other organization and their family names do not correspond to EINRIDE or the disputed domain names.

The Complainant contends there is no evidence of demonstrable preparations to use nor actual use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Respondent has unlawfully used two of the disputed domain names (<einiride.tech> and <einride-tech.com>) to impersonate employees of the Complainant. These emails included the actual employee names, titles, and the Complainant's official website, misleading recipients. According to the Complainant, the Respondent used these emails to attempt to divert payments to accounts presumably under its control. One such attempt involved a company called 'Einride Investment Ltd', falsely presented as being associated with the Complainant. This company was created just one day before the phishing emails and changed its name to something entirely different around two weeks later.

Further, the Complainant also contends that while there is no direct evidence that the third domain name (<einirde.tech>) has been used for phishing;, its similar typosquatting composition, presence of MX records, and false WHOIS data suggest a high likelihood of fraudulent use. Additionally, the fact that the third domain name does not resolve to an active website further demonstrates a lack of bona fide use or legitimate interest.

Third UDRP Element – The disputed domain names were Registered and are Being Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant asserts that its EINRIDE trademarks enjoy recognition across multiple countries, well before the registration of the disputed domain names. Further, top Google search results for terms like 'einirde,' 'einiride,' and 'einride-tech' lead to the Complainant's offerings. Therefore, the Complainant contends that any registrant conducting even the most basic search would have been aware of the well-established EINRIDE brand at the time of registration, making it unlikely that the Respondent could have been unaware of the Complainant's prior trademark rights.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has also demonstrated bad faith in the use of <einiride.tech> and <einride-tech.com> by impersonating the Complainant's employees in an attempt to phish payments from internet users, as previously described. The Respondent has used names and similar email addresses to those of the Complainant's employees, directly referencing the official website <einride.tech>, and has included deceptive email addresses, which at first glance appear to be controlled by the Complainant. This was done to solicit payments to accounts presumably controlled by the Respondent and the fictitious entity 'Einride Investment Ltd,' which has no affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant further submits that despite sending a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent in June 2024 regarding <einirde.tech>, the Respondent not only failed to respond but also proceeded to register another infringing domain name, <einride-tech.com>, which further demonstrates bad faith. The Respondent's phishing scheme and fraudulent conduct with the use of these domain names clearly show malicious intent. The Complainant notes that although there is no direct evidence of the use of <einirde.tech> for phishing, its similarities with the other domain names, MX records, and false WHOIS data indicate a high likelihood of bad faith use.

In light of the evidence, the Complainant concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith, especially given the Respondent's failure to respond to the cease-and-desist letter and use of false WHOIS information.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names should be transferred to it. Specifics of the Complainant's contentions are summarized above.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

LANGUAGE OF PROCEEDING

According to Rule 11 in the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, (the "Rules") "...the language of the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding."

According to the information on the case file, the Registrar confirmed that the Respondent is the current registrant of the disputed domain names, and that the language of the registration agreements is English.

As neither party has asked to deviate from the English language as per the registration agreements, the Panel finds that this proceeding may be properly conducted in English.

CONSOLIDATION OF MULTIPLE RESPONDENTS

As stated in section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), when considering consolidation requests panels should look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency underpins such consideration.

The Panel has concluded that consolidation is warranted in this case.

According to the Registrar Verification in the case file, the names and the addresses of the two Respondents are different. However, this difference in registrant details is not dispositive since registrars are not typically required to verify the identity of registrants.

Factors pointing to the disputed domain names being subject to common control include:

a. Registration Dates: There is close proximity in the dates of registration of the disputed domain names. According to the Registrar Verification <einiride.tech> and <einride-tech.com> were both registered on June 1,2025 while <einirde.tech> has a registration date of May 20, 2025. The Panel assumes that the reference in the Registrar Verification to 2025 was intended to be a reference to 2024 and proceeds on that basis. In this case, all three domain names registered within a short period of around two weeks;
b. Evidence of Phishing Activity: Evidence that at least two of the domain names (<einiride.tech> and <einride-tech.com>) were used for similar phishing activity, including sending fraudulent emails to the same email addresses.
c. Similarity of the disputed domain names: The similarity of the disputed domain names, which are typosquatting variations of the Complainant's EINRIDE mark and official website (<einride.tech>). While there is no evidence submitted that <einirde.tech> disputed domain name has been directly used for phishing, it follows a compellingly similar pattern of misspelling and typosquatting as one of the other disputed domain names, namely <einiride.tech>.
d. Registrar: All three disputed domain names were registered with the same registrar, PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com;
e. Registrant: The disclosed registrant identities for the disputed domain names reflect false postal addresses, with no such addresses existing in the provided locations, indicating a modus operandi pattern of falsifying addresses.

The above circumstances, taken together, lead the Panel to conclude that it is more likely than not that the disputed domain names are under common control, and that consolidation of the cases against the Respondents would be fair and equitable to all parties. Given such common control, hereinafter the two Respondents shall be referred to by the singular term "Respondent".

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

THREE ELEMENTS THE COMPLAINANT MUST ESTABLISH UNDER THE POLICY

According to Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(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 and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has examined the evidence available to it and has come to the following conclusions concerning the satisfaction of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in these proceedings:

(A) THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES TO THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS

Sufficient evidence has been submitted by the Complainant of its trademark rights in the term EINRIDE in numerous classes and territories around the world. Such trademark rights were created and registered long prior to May 20, 2024 and June 1, 2024 the respective creation dates of the disputed domain names. A nationally or regionally registered trademark confers on its owner sufficient rights to satisfy the requirement of having trademark rights for the purposes of standing to file a UDRP case. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant possess rights in its EINRIDE trademark such that it has standing under the Policy.

UDRP panels have held that where the disputed domain name is a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark it may be considered to be confusingly similar. In the present case, two of the disputed domain names <einirde.tech> and <einiride.tech> consist of the EINRIDE trademark reproduced almost in its entirety with a - difficult to discern - inversion of the letters ''R'' and ''I'' within the term EINRIDE, instead of its original sequence, and in the other domain name the addition of the letter ''I'' between the ''EIN'' and the ''RIDE'. The Panel finds the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark EINRIDE under a side by-side analysis because ''EINIRDE'' and ''EINIRIDE'' are visually similar to EINRIDE, particularly when looked at quickly, and include changes from the Complainant's mark that follow classic typo-squatting strategies. Further, UDRP panels have held that where the asserted trademark is recognizable within a disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See, e.g., LEGO Juris A/S v. DBA David Inc/ DomainsByProxy.com, Case No. D2011-1290 (WIPO, September 20, 2011) ("the mere addition of the words ‚Ninjago' and ‚Kai' is not sufficient to exclude the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark."). In the present case, the disputed domain name <einride-tech.com> consists of the EINRIDE trademark reproduced in its entirety with the addition of the generic but related term ''-tech''. .

In assessing confusing similarity, the Panel finds all three of the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the EINRIDE trademark in which the Complainant's have rights because each incorporates the entirety of the EINRIDE trademark, and differ from such mark merely by either the inclusion of a typo-variant following a classing typo-squatting strategy or by adding the aforementioned generic but related term "tech". These additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity considering the prominence of the distinctive EINRIDE mark within the disputed domain names.

The TLD – in this case ''.tech'' and ''.com'' - may usually be ignored for the purpose of determination of identity or confusing similarity between a domain name and the Complainant's trademarks as it is technical requirement of registration (see paragraph 1.11.1 WIPO Overview 3.0).

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

(B) THE RESPONDENT'S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES

The second element of the Policy requires that the Complainant establishes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The generally adopted approach, when considering the second element, is that if a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to rebut it; see, for example, WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1 ("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."). However, the burden of proof still remains with the complainant to make out its prima facie case on a balance of probabilities. Moreover, the wording of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires a complainant to establish that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name in issue. Simply establishing that the complainant also has rights in the domain name in issue is insufficient.

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy contemplates an examination of the available facts to determine whether a respondent has rights or legitimate interest in the domain name. Paragraph 4(c) sets out a list of circumstances through which a respondent may demonstrate that it does have such rights or interests.

The first circumstance, under Paragraph 4(c)(i), is where "before any notice to you of the dispute, your 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". Here, according to the Complaint, the disputed domain names currently are inactive websites. Accordingly, the Panel finds no evidence of a bona fide offering or goods or services or demonstrable preparations to use per Policy 4(c)(i) and the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain names thereunder.

The second circumstance, under Paragraph 4(c)(ii), concerns cases where the respondent is commonly known by the domain name. Here, according to the registrar verification, the Respondent names are '' paul obi'' and '' Joanna Drochuck'' and have no similarity or connection to the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names. As such, this second circumstance of legitimate rights or interests under the Policy is not applicable to the Respondent.

Regarding the third circumstance, under Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, there is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant´s EINRIDE trademark. According to Complainant and as confirmed by the Panel at the time of preparing this decision, the disputed domain names are currently inactive which by itself does not show a bona fide offering of goods and services. The Complainant alleges, and provides evidence supporting it's allegations, that the Respondent has used two of the email addresses associated with the three of the disputed domain names (<einiride.tech> and <einride-tech.com>) to impersonate employees of the Complainant. This impersonation formed part of a phishing scheme involving sending fraudulent emails to divert payments to accounts presumably under the Respondent's control. One such attempt involved a company called 'Einride Investment Ltd', falsely presented as being associated with the Complainant. According to evidence submitted by the Complainant, this company was created just one day before the phishing emails and changed its name to something entirely different around two weeks later.

Use of a disputed domain name to pass off as a complainant through impersonation emails is not a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy. Lastly, the Complaint states that the Respondent is not licensed, nor has any relationship with or authority to represent the Complainant in any way.

Accordingly, the Complainant has sufficiently made out their prima-facie case on the second element of the Policy. Thus, the burden of proof is shifted to the Respondent to rebut the Complainant's case. Here, because the Respondent has not participated in these proceedings, there is no such rebuttal to consider, and the Complainant prevails.

The Panel therefore concludes that neither the Respondent nor the evidence establishes that the Respondent has any right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names. The Complainant has therefore also satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

(C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES

The third element requires the Complainant to show that the disputed domain names have been registered and used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. See, e.g. Hallmark Licensing, LLC v. EWebMall, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2015-2202 ("The standard of proof under the Policy is often expressed as the "balance of the probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence" standard. Under this standard, an asserting party needs to establish that it is more likely than not that the claimed fact is true.").

Further, Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of four circumstances, any one of which may be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. The four specified circumstances are:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or 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 of a 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 on-line 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 site or location.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy because:

1. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names and the Complainant confirms that the Respondent has never been affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark(s) and/or register the disputed domain names. Nor is there any business or other association between the Complainant and the Respondent.
2. The Complainant's EINRIDE trademark is distinctive and holds a considerable reputation in its industry, as demonstrated by its position as a global leader in digital, electric, and autonomous freight mobility technology. Complainant operates in several countries, including Sweden, Norway, Germany, the Benelux region, the UK, and the US. Since 2018, the

Complainant has consistently promoted its services and industry insights through its website, <einride.tech>. The Complainant has garnered substantial recognition within the autonomous vehicle industry, including appearing in third-party rankings of top self-driving truck companies. Because of the established status of the Complainant, it is more probable than not that the Respondent either knew, or should have known, that the disputed domain names would be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and thus they registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant in mind. Further, the evidence of targeting by the Respondent is compelling. The disputed domain names comprise Complainant's distinctive EINRIDE mark – or typo variants thereof - with the addition of the generic but related term ''-tech'', obviously meant to represent the official website where the Complainant offers its products and with which the Complainant can therefore be closely and relevantly associated.

3. The non-active use of the disputed domain names in this case satisfies the doctrine of passive holding as described in WIPO Case No. D2000-0003 Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows considering all of the circumstances of the case because (i) the Complainant's trademark is distinctive and has a strong reputation in its sector, (ii) the Respondent failed to respond to these proceedings and thus has provided no evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) it is impossible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain names by the Respondent in light of the close mimicking of the domain name used for the Complainant's official website and the Respondent's utilization of classic typo-squatting tactics.
4. The Panel finds that at the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain names, namely during the period between May 20, 2024 and June 01, 2024, it can be inferred that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's EINRIDE mark. Such inference can be drawn because of the subsequent utilization of the disputed domain names. Evidence included with the Complaint shows the Respondent used two of the three disputed domain names to create e-mail addresses to impersonate employees of the Complainant, as part of a phishing scheme. This scheme involved sending emails purporting to be communications from the Complainant, in an attempt to divert payments to accounts presumably under Respondent's control. Using a disputed domain name to improperly pass off as an employee of a complainant via email is a strong indicator of bad faith under the Policy.
5. As a final point, the Panel may draw a negative inference from the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's cease and desist letter and silence though these proceedings.

In light of the above analysis, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has made out its case that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith, and thus has satisfied the requirements under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **einiride.tech**: Transferred
2. **einride-tech.com**: Transferred
3. **einirde.tech**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Claire Kowarsky**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2024-09-20

Publish the Decision