Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107571

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107571
Time of filing	2025-05-15 09:20:15
Domain names	informa.events

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Informa Group Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Stobbs IP

Respondent

Organization	Galitege Solutions

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 name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is owner of the following registered trademarks including the wording "INFORMA":

- the US trademark (word) "INFORMA" no. 3686130 registered since 22 September 2009 in classes 42, 44;
- the UK trademark (word) "INFORMA" no. UK00002561684 registered since 29 April 2011 in classes 9, 16, 41;
- the UK trademark (device) "INFORMA" no. UK00003856437 registered since 28 April 2023 in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42;

Furthermore, the Complainant owns multiple domain names consisting in the wording “INFORMA”, such as the domain name <informa.com> registered since 2 March 1995 and used in relation to the Complainant's main website to promote its goods and services.

The above-mentioned rights of the Complainant are hereinafter referred to as the INFORMA Trademark.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a leading international business-to-business events, digital services, and academic publishing company, headquartered in the United Kingdom. It forms part of Informa PLC, a FTSE 100-listed group. As of 2024, the Group employed over 14,000 people in more than 30 countries, serving customers in over 150 countries worldwide. Established in 1998 through the

merger of IBG Group plc and Lloyd's of London Press, the Group has grown into a prominent global player. In 2024, the Group reported revenues of £3.553 billion, reflecting 11.6% underlying growth.

The Complainant offers a wide range of services and products—such as live and on-demand events, specialist content, accredited training, academic research, and digital marketing—through its portfolio of established brands, structured under five divisions: INFORMA MARKETS, INFORMA CONNECT, INFORMA FESTIVALS, INFORMA TECHTARGET, and TAYLOR & FRANCIS.

The Complainant owns registered rights in the INFORMA Trademark since 2009. The INFORMA brand enjoys significant goodwill and recognition across various sectors.

The Group has continuously used the domain name <informa.com> to host its official website since at least 29 February 2000. The website provides extensive information about the Complainant's divisions, services, investor relations, and other corporate activities. The Complainant also owns several related domain names that incorporate the INFORMA mark.

Additionally, the Group operates mobile applications, including the Informa Markets Events app, which is available on mainstream platforms and supports event participation, networking, and planning. The INFORMA Trademark is prominently used throughout these digital offerings.

The Complainant maintains active social media channels with a significant following, further reinforcing the online presence and recognition of the INFORMA brand.

The Respondent is Dave Kupczyk / Galitege Solutions, located in Arizona, the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on 17 August 2024 and redirects to the Complainant's website.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is 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 name (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 name has been registered and is 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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to succeed in the administrative proceeding:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark 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 by the Respondent in bad faith.

I. THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND THE IDENTITY OR CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME TO THE COMPLAINANT'S MARK

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the INFORMA Trademark.

The disputed domain name consists of the wording "INFORMA", plus the TLD ".EVENTS".

In UDRP disputes, the test for identity or confusing similarity involves a straightforward, reasoned comparison between the complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. This typically entails a side-by-side evaluation of the domain name and the textual elements of the relevant trademark to determine if the mark is recognizable within the domain name. When a domain name fully incorporates a trademark, or at least a dominant feature of it is evident in the domain name, the domain name is generally deemed confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of UDRP standing.

The top-level domain (TLD) is usually disregarded in determining identity or similarity, as it is simply a technical aspect of registration. The practice of ignoring the TLD in determining identity or confusing similarity is applied irrespective of the particular TLD, including with regard to new gTLDs; the ordinary meaning ascribed to a particular TLD would not necessarily impact assessment of the first element. In cases where the TLD corresponds to the complainant's area of trade so as to signal an abusive intent to confuse Internet users, panels have found this relevant to assessment under the third element.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven the first element of the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark.

II. THE RESPONDENT'S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant bears the burden of establishing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Once the Complainant makes a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the domain name.

The Respondent has been identified as Dave Kupczyk / Galitege Solutions, located in Arizona, the United States. There is no evidence that the Respondent, whether as an individual, business, or other organization, has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any rights in a trademark or trade name corresponding to it.

The Complainant asserts that it has no relationship whatsoever with the Respondent. The Respondent has never received any approval—express or implied—from the Complainant to use its trademark or to register or use the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on 17 August 2024, well after the Complainant's INFORMA Trademark. It is identical to such mark.

UDRP panels have found that domain names identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation.

Furthermore, the Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name was redirected to the Complainant's main website. Such redirection, rather than indicating any legitimate business activity, appears intended to create confusion or suggest an affiliation with the Complainant.

In light of the above, the Panel finds no indication that, prior to notice of the dispute, the Respondent used—or made demonstrable preparations to use—the disputed domain name, or any corresponding name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the available evidence points to an attempt to mislead Internet users, divert traffic, or exploit the Complainant's reputation. These actions fall well outside the scope of legitimate non-commercial or fair use under the Policy.

While the Complainant has established its prima facie case, the Respondent has not submitted a Response to the Complaint and, thus, has failed to invoke any of the circumstances, which could demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met the second requirement under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, and finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

III. THE REGISTRATION AND THE USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IN BAD FAITH

The Complainant has adequately demonstrated its rights in the prior and well-known INFORMA Trademark, which has been registered since 2009.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the top-level domain ".events" corresponds to the Complainant's field of activity. The fact that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's official site supports the inference that the Respondent intended to create confusion among Internet users seeking the Complainant. The Panel has confirmed this redirection by visiting the domain name, which indeed resolves to the Complainant's website.

UDRP panels have consistently held that the registration of a domain name identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated party may, on its own, support a finding of bad faith.

Given the distinctiveness and established reputation of the Complainant's trademark, it is implausible that the Respondent registered the domain name without actual knowledge of the Complainant and its rights. On the contrary, the totality of circumstances strongly suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant, its activities, and its trademark at the time of registration.

By redirecting the domain to the Complainant's own website, the Respondent appears to have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website—conduct that falls squarely within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **informa.events**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Ivett Paulovics**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-06-23

Publish the Decision