Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108002

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108002
Time of filing	2025-09-26 18:29:48
Domain names	dunatar.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Dunatár Kft

Complainant representative

Organization	Siegler Bird & Bird Ugyvedi Iroda

Respondent

Name	TOO SMART REFINERY / Aaron Shephard

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 the owner of the Hungarian trademark application Nr. M2502094 for the designation “Dunatár” (fig.) for services in classes No. 35, 39 and 42 with the priority of 3 July 2025 as well as the domain name <dunatar.hu> registered on 12 December 2024.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant in this administrative proceeding is DUNATÁR Kőolajterméktároló és Kereskedelmi Korlátolt Felelősségű Társaság, a limited liability company established under the laws of Hungary on 6 April 1999. The short name of the Complainant is Dunatár Kft. The name of the Complainant has been remained unchanged since 1999.

The Complainant was established by OMV Hungária Kft., member of the OMV Group. The aim of establishing the company and its fuel storage facility on the southern shore of the oil port of Csepel. The plant started operations in March 2001 and it has been OMV's main storage and logistics centre in Hungary ever since, therefore it is a priority infrastructure institution (critical infrastructure under Hungarian law), and there are strong national interests in its smooth operation.

The Complainant is the holder of Hungarian trademark application by the Hungarian Intellectual Property Office (HIPO) under App No M2502094 for the designation “Dunatár” (fig.) for services in classes No 35, 39 and 42 with the priority of 3 July 2025.

The disputed domain name <dunatar.com > (hereinafter, the “Disputed Domain Name”) was registered on 29 March 2025 and it shows a website which appears to be an official website of the Complainant, using the data and logo (same as the mark of the Complainant’s Trademark Application).

According to Complainant’s non-contested allegations, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and he is not related in any way to the Complainant’s business.

For the purpose of this case, the Registrar confirmed that the Respondent is the current registrant of the Disputed Domain Name and that the language of the registration agreement is English.

Respondent did not reply to the Complaint.

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

LEGAL GROUNDS:

COMPLAINANT:

PRELIMINARY PROCEDURAL QUESTIONS

First element: Similarity

The Complainant is the holder of Hungarian trademark application applied for by the HIPO under App No M2502094 for the designation “Dunatár” (fig.) in services in classes No 35, 39 and 42 (Complainant’s Trademark Application) as well as the domain name <dunatar.hu>. The application date thereof is 3 July 2025. The application is pending at the HIPO. The Complainant is aware that the registration date of the Disputed Domain Name (29 March 2025) is earlier than the application date of the Complainant’s Trademark and it is not yet registered. However, the Complainant is of the opinion that this fact does not by itself preclude the Complainant’s standing to file a UDRP case, nor a panel’s finding of identity or confusing similarity as well as accepting the Respondent’s bad faith. For sake of clarity, the Complainant was not aware of the Respondent applying for the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has not (i) consented to, (ii) authorised, or (iii) endorsed the said application.

The Complainant indicates that it has been using the brand and company name “DUNATÁR” since 1999, when the Complainant was established. As a result of the activities of the Complainant, this brand acquired distinctiveness and therefore serves as a basis for identity or confusing similarity under the first element of the preconditions in the Policy.

The Complainant’s name “DUNATÁR” comes from the river Duna (in English: Danube) and from the Hungarian noun tároló (in English: storage). The Complainant’s main business activity is storage of petrol at its registered seat on the island of Csepel on the river Danube. The combination of these two terms forms the company name and brand “DUNATÁR”, which is also the clearly dominant element and title of the figurative mark as the Complainant’s Trademark Application. The Complainant states that it has been using this figurative mark and the name “DUNATÁR” for decades. Hence, the Complainant confirms that this brand is widely recognised by Hungarian and European businesses in the oil and gas sector.

The brand “DUNATÁR”, including the domain name <dunatar.hu>, is hereinafter referred to as the Complainant’s Brand. In accordance with the Complainant, Hungarian law recognises brand names or commercial names as a valid title to object to unauthorised use of identical or confusing similar names by competitors, including objection to domain names. The legal background of such protection is the Hungarian Competition Act, namely Act LVII of 1996 on the Prohibition of Unfair and Restrictive Market Practices.

The Complainant is aware of the fact that under the UDPR usually a registered trademark is required for establishing rights at the end of the Complainant. However, the Complainant is also aware that there might be circumstances which support that a Complaint based on unregistered trademarks and trademark applications might be successful. The Complainant is of the opinion that in the subject matter such circumstances are existing, so the Complainant requests the panel in charge to accept that the Complaint is based on the Complainant’s Trademark Application and the Complainant’s Brand. In Hungary the concept of unregistered trademarks recognised under the umbrella of competition law. The Complainant believes having an exclusive right to use the Complainant’s Brand based on the provisions of the Hungarian Competition Act.

The Complainant indicates that unregistered or common law trademark rights for purposes of the UDRP require the Complainant showing that its mark has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the Complainant’s goods and/or services. Relevant evidence demonstrating such acquired distinctiveness (also referred to as secondary meaning) includes a range of factors such as the duration and nature of use of the mark. To this end, the Complainant provided with evidence articles from Hungarian language press which contain an overview of the Complainant’s operation at the site in Budapest as well as mentions that the site started operation in 2001, almost 25 years ago. With this, the Complainant is of the opinion that it has demonstrated its rights to an unregistered trademark regarding the mark “DUNATÁR” under the Hungarian Competition Act.

The Complainant also indicates that the availability of trademark-like protection under certain national legal doctrines (e.g., unfair competition or passing-off) and considerations of parity, where acquired distinctiveness/secondary meaning is demonstrated in a particular UDRP case, unregistered rights have been found to support standing to proceed with a UDRP case including where the

complainant is based in a civil law jurisdiction.

The Complainant believes that it has demonstrated its rights to an unregistered trademark regarding the mark “DUNATÁR” under the Hungarian Competition Act. Therefore, its right to stand as a complainant to file a UDRP complaint is confirmed.

The Complainant states that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant’s Brand and the Complainant’s Trademark Application. The only difference (in the word element) is that the Disputed Domain Name contains letter “a” instead of the Hungarian letter “á”, but this is not relevant as letter “a” is the usual replacement of the letter “á” which is a special character in the Hungarian (non-standard Latin) alphabet, in particular in domain names under the gTLD <.com>. The TLD part of the Disputed Domain Name, i.e., the <.com> suffix is not relevant for the assessment of the identity either. In the unlikely event that the panel would conclude that the Disputed Domain Name is not identical with the Complaint’s Brand, there is no doubt that the Disputed Domain Name is at least confusingly similar to the Complainant’s Brand, including the Complainant’s Trademark Application.

Second element: Rights or legitimate interest

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

Prior to registration of the Domain Name on 29 March 2025, the Complainant indicated that there was an attempt to squat the domain name <dunatar.hu> probably by the same person than registered the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant believes that the existence of a pattern for squatting of domain names with the “DUNATAR” word makes it crystal clear that the Respondent cannot have any rights or legitimate interest for the Disputed Domain Name.

Apparently, the Respondent’s sole purpose with the Disputed Domain Name and the website replicated under it to identify itself as the Complainant, i.e., to misled business partners and public, in particular that the website contains sections on the history of the Complainant information which was obtained from public sources. For sake of clarity, the Complainant states that there is no other “DUNATÁR” entity nor has any other entity rights to the use of the brand “DUNATÁR” other than the Complainant.

The Complainant below describes why the Respondent should be considered as having no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant addresses the scenarios set forth out at paragraph 4(c) of the Policy:

a) Before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, there is no evidence of the Respondent’s use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant stresses that the Disputed Domain Name is only masquerades itself as the domain name and official website of the Complainant, using its identity clearly in bad faith.

b) The Respondent has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not acquired trademark and has no brand name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name as the only legal, private or other entity uses this name is the Complainant.

c) The Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. In fact, due to the content of the website available under the domain name, the only use and aim of the Respondent is to portray itself as the Complainant and provides its own contacts and gaining information, which can be concluded that the Respondent has intent for commercial gain misleadingly to divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s name and validity.

Third element: Bad faith

At beginning of 2025, the Complainant was notified by its business partners about a fraudulent website available under the domain name <dunatar.hu>, which appeared to be an official website of the Complainant, using the data and logo (same as the mark of the Complainant’s Trademark Application) on the website. The content of this fraudulent website was replicated on the website currently available under the Disputed Domain Name, i.e., <dunatar.com>. The phone numbers and e-mail addresses (“info@dunatar.[...]”) shown on said websites are also the same.

On 14 February 2025, the Complainant contacted the Council of Hungarian Internet Providers and requested information about the registration of the domain name <dunatar.hu>, as names of individuals are redacted in the publicly available .hu WHOIS. The Council of Hungarian Internet Providers informed the Complainant that the name of the registrant of the domain name <dunatar.hu> is Aaron Shephard, apparently a private individual. There was no confirmation that this name was real, in particular that the provided address seems to be fake.

The Complainant has recently discovered that a third party claimed the profile information for the Complainant in Google Maps. On said profile the same telephone number was indicated as on the earlier website under the domain name <dunatar.hu> and the website under the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the profile also contained the Disputed Domain Name thereby misleading the public about the real identity of the business to be found at the address of the Complainant. The Complainant initiated recovery of the Google Maps profile by requesting transfer of the profile. The previous holder of the profile rejected to allow this. After this the Complainant requested Google to send a verification code by post to the address of the Complainant. By using this the Complainant eventually recovered the profile.

The Complainant below describes why the Disputed Domain Name should be considered as having been registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent in the above-described circumstances. The Complainant addresses the scenarios set forth out at paragraph 4(b) of the Policy:

a) The Disputed Domain Name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business continuity of the Complainant, or for obtaining confidential information from Complainant's business partners, vendors and suppliers by misleading them by showing a mobile phone number and e-mail address on the website available under the domain name. The Complainant believes that this might have caused confusion at the end of business partners of the Complainant who tried to send communication, including highly confidential business information, to the Complainant, but such messages might have landed at the Respondent. The Complainant refers to the fact that the Registrant applied for the Disputed Domain Name after the Complainant successfully recovered the domain name <dunatar.hu> by means of .hu alternative dispute resolution proceedings;

b) Registration of the Disputed Domain Name also deprives the Complainant from reflecting the Complainant's Brand in a domain name under the <.com> gTLD, i.e., the Disputed Domain Name.

RESPONDENT

Respondent did not reply to the Complaint.

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

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

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 domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

(i) the 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 domain name; and

(iii) the domain name has been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel has reviewed in detail 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 the proceeding:

- THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IS CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TO THE DUNATÁR® MARK OF THE COMPLAINANT.

As described at WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.7., the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement and 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.

In this vein, this element requires the Panel to consider: i) if the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and ii) if the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

As to the first point, the Complainant has confirmed that it is the owner of Hungarian trademark application No M2502094 for the designation "Dunatár" (fig.) in services in classes No 35, 39 and 42 with application date thereof is 3 July 2025. However, the Panel notes that a pending trademark application would not by itself establish trademark rights within the meaning of UDRP paragraph 4(a)(i), see WIPO Overview 3.0., section 1.1.4.

Nevertheless, previous UDRP panels have consistently held that the Policy recognizes sufficient rights in a trademark or service mark where a complainant is able to establish common law or unregistered trademark rights. To establish such rights, a complainant must demonstrate that its mark has become a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with the complainant's goods and/or services.

The WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.3, provides guidance about what evidence is relevant in assessing a claim to common law trademark rights, as follows:

Relevant evidence demonstrating such acquired distinctiveness (also referred to as secondary meaning) includes a range of factors such as (i) the duration and nature of use of the mark, (ii) the number of sales under the mark, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry, media) recognition, and (v) consumer surveys.

The Complainant indicates that it has been established as a fuel storage facility on the southern shore of the oil port of Csepel. The Complainant states that it has been using the brand and company name "DUNATÁR" since 1999, when the Complainant was established by OMV Hungária Kft., member of the OMV Group. The Complainant also indicated that the name "DUNATÁR" comes from the river Duna (in English: Danube) and from the Hungarian noun tároló (in English: storage). The combination of these two terms forms the company name and brand "DUNATÁR".

To demonstrate the duration and nature of its use of the mark, the Complainant has submitted the following evidence in support of the Complaint:

- Official company extract showing the incorporation of the complainant on 6 April 1999
- A URL link connected to Complainant's parent company including a description about the company as well as a you tube video showing the usage of the brand DUNATÁR in one of the bulk storage tanks.
- Articles from Hungarian language showing an overview of the Complainant's operation at the site in Budapest as well as mentioning that the site started operation in 2001, so almost 25 years ago.

While the evidence presented may appear limited at first glance, it is relevant to note that the Complainant operates in a sophisticated and specialized industry, in which it has been active for more than 20 years. Within that industry, the Complainant appears to be recognized by relevant market participants. Indeed, the Respondent's actions in registering and using the Disputed Domain Name in a manner that purports to identify itself as the Complainant confirm the Complainant's reputation within this field – including the fact that the Complainant also recovered the domain name <dunatar.hu> from the Respondent via a Local Proceeding, in particular due to the use of the same e-mail address to register the Disputed Domain Name as well as the domain name <dunatar.hu> in accordance with the evidence submitted by the Complainant. The Complainant's name, "DUNATÁR" also appears to be distinctive and not comprised solely of descriptive terms, as explained in the Complaint; i.e. the meaning of the term DUNATÁR which is the result of the combination of the term river Duna (in English: Danube) and from the Hungarian noun tároló (in English: storage).

On the basis of the evidence submitted and in the absence of any response from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated that its mark has become a distinctive identifier of its business. The Panel further notes that any secondary meaning acquired by the mark need not be global; the existence of such recognition within a particular geographic or industry context is sufficient to establish common law trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy.

In addition, the Panel takes note of the Complainant's reference to Hungarian law, which under the Competition Act recognizes brand names or commercial names as valid bases to oppose the unauthorized use of identical or confusingly similar identifiers by competitors, including in domain names. Given that the Complainant has demonstrated secondary meaning for the purposes of the Policy, the Panel finds it appropriate to take into account Complainant's comments regarding Hungarian Law and therefore, it is safe to conclude that the Complainant has standing to bring this proceeding based on its unregistered rights, consistent with WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.3.

Having completed the first part of the analysis, the Panel now focuses on the review of the second part; i.e. whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the DUNATÁR mark.

From the Panel's perspective, the Disputed Domain Name <dunatar.com> is composed of almost all letters of the mark "DUNATÁR" with the replacement of the vowel "Á" with "A", which is a special character in the Hungarian (non-standard Latin) alphabet.

Previous panels have found that special attention should be paid to domain names where the difference in spelling is so insignificant that it is hardly noticeable and does not change the distinctive character of the mark in question. See, e.g., BOURSORAMA SA v. francois goubert, CAC Case No. 104595: "This also applies to domain names where the difference in spelling is so insignificant that it is hardly noticeable and does not change the distinctive character of the mark in question. Most readers

would be hard put to quickly spot the difference between "BOURSORAMA" and "BOUSORAMA". This takes some analysis, especially at the mind reads what it expects to see from previous experience. In this case, that expectation would be to read the well-known word "BOURSORAMA".

UDRP panels agree that the TLD may usually be ignored for the purpose of determination of identity or confusing similarity between a domain name and the Complainant's trademark as it is technical requirement of registration. See paragraph 1.11.1 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's "DUNATÁR" mark.

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

The second element of the Policy requires that the Complainant establishes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The generally adopted approach by UDRP panels, 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 WIPO Jurisprudential Overview, version 3.0., paragraph 2.1).

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has never been authorized, expressly or impliedly, to use its trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating or confusingly similar to them. The Complainant further states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and that there is no evidence the Respondent owns any trademark or trade name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name.

The record contains no indication that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The use of a privacy protection service, coupled with the absence of any evidence of a personal, corporate, or other legitimate identifier matching the Disputed Domain Name, supports the conclusion that the Respondent is not commonly known by it.

Furthermore, the Complaint argues that it does not have any relationship with the Respondent whatsoever. Finally, the Complainant indicated that there is no evidence that the Respondent has acquired any rights in a trademark or trade name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name.

From the information provided by the Complainant, there is no evidence or reason to believe that the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name using a privacy protected service and this is all what links the Disputed Domain Name with the Respondent. Absent of any other evidence such as a personal name, nickname or corporate identifier, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant also contends that the Disputed Domain Name constitutes a typographical variant of its mark "DUNATÁR". Past panels have consistently held that typosquatting—registering a domain name to exploit typographical errors of internet users—demonstrates a lack of rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., Pentair Flow Services AG v. Scott Fisher, CAC Case No. 103931, "Since typosquatting is a practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of internet users' typographical errors, this circumstance is also evidence that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interest in the disputed domain name").

Furthermore, the evidence shows that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website imitating the Complainant's official site, reproducing its logo and other identifying elements. In the absence of any response from the Respondent, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that the Disputed Domain Name has been used to impersonate the Complainant. The use of a domain name for deceptive or fraudulent activity, including impersonation or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy (see WIPO Overview 3.0, paragraph 2.13).

Therefore, the Panel concludes that neither the Respondent nor the evidence establishes that the Respondent has any right or legitimate interest to the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has therefore also satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

- THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME HAS BEEN REGISTERED AND IS BEING USED IN BAD FAITH IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY.

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy indicates that Complainant must assert that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. In this sense, Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four circumstances which 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 acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed 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 Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) The Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Disputed 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.

The evidence submitted by Complainant confirms that its mark "DUNATÁR" is distinctive. Absent of Respondent's reply, the Panel finds that Respondent, prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain Name was aware of Complainant's trademark, in particular since the Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 8, 2025 and the Complainant's mark has been used at least more than 20 years.

Furthermore, the Complainant provided with evidence showing that the Disputed Domain Name was set up by the Respondent to create a website to impersonate the Complainant. In this sense, the Complainant has confirmed that no authorization was granted to the Respondent to register the Disputed Domain Name and no counterargument has been submitted by Respondent. This is a clear indication that the Disputed Domain Name was set up with the only intention 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.

In light of the evidence presented to the Panel, including: a) the likelihood of confusion between the Disputed Domain Name and the mark "DUNATÁR, b) the lack of reply to this Complaint by Respondent, and c) the fact that the Disputed Domain Name is being used for a website to impersonate Complainant, the Panel draws the inference that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and are being used in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith and thus has satisfied the requirement 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. **dunatar.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Victor Garcia Padilla**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-11-10

Publish the Decision