# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108394

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108394 |
| Time of filing | 2026-02-06 14:16:42 |
| Domain names | inwxdomain.com |

## Case administrator

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

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | INWX GmbH |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Vikas Solanke |

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

Complainant is the owner of the European Union trademark nr. 018729512 INWX with registration date 22 October 2022.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

According to the information provided by the registrar the disputed domain name <inwxdomain.com> was registered on 15 January 2026.

At the time of decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. Previously, the disputed domain name has been used for a website with negative comments about Complainant.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

**Complainant**

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

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusing similar to its trademark INWX as it combines the trademark with the purely descriptive term “domain”. According to Complainant Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests and the disputed domain name had been registered and is being used in bad faith as the website under the disputed domain name contains defamatory content.

**Respondent**

Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant's contentions. However, in its email dated 12 February 2026, Respondent stated: "I, the Respondent hereby unilaterally and unconditionally consent to the remedy requested by Complainant. Specifically, I agree to the immediately transfer of the disputed domain name inwxdomain.com to the Complainant".

Complainant answered in its message of 18 February 2026: "Do we need to take action or should we wait for the respondents signature".

No formal settlement agreement was signed and Respondent's was formally notified on 4 March 20267 that no administratively compliant response has been submitted.

## RIGHTS

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 Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

## NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown 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

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

Section 4.10 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1") provides as follows:

"How do panels handle cases involving a respondent's informal or unilateral consent for the transfer of the domain name to the complainant outside the "standard settlement process" described above?
Where parties to a UDRP proceeding have not been able to settle their dispute prior to the issuance of a panel decision using the "standard settlement process" described above, but where the respondent has nevertheless given its consent on the record to the transfer (or cancellation) remedy sought by the complainant, many panels will order the requested remedy solely on the basis of such consent. In such cases, the panel gives effect to an understood party agreement as to the disposition of their case (whether by virtue of deemed admission, or on a no-fault basis).

In some cases, despite such respondent consent, a panel may in its discretion still find it appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits. Scenarios in which a panel may find it appropriate to do so include (i) where the panel finds a broader interest in recording a substantive decision on the merits – notably recalling UDRP paragraph 4(b)(ii) discussing a pattern of bad faith conduct, (ii) where while consenting to the requested remedy the respondent has expressly disclaimed any bad faith, (iii) where the complainant has not agreed to accept such consent and has expressed a preference for a recorded decision on the merits, (iv) where there is ambiguity as to the scope of the respondent's consent, or (v) where the panel wishes to be certain that the complainant has shown that it possesses relevant trademark rights."

The parties have not made a request to suspend the proceeding for purposes of settlement. It appears that the simplest and most cost-effective way to proceed in the current circumstances is for the Panel to order a transfer based on the consent of Respondent to transfer. In this case the Panel finds that the e-mail of Respondent of 12 February 20206 undoubtedly and unequivocal demonstrate the consent of Respondent to have the disputed domain name transferred to Complainant.

The fact that no settlement agreement has been concluded between the Parties does, in the view of the Panel, not affect the effectiveness of Respondent's unilateral consent to the transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Panel does not find there is reason to issue a fully reasoned decision, as set out in the final paragraph of section 4.10 of WIPO Overview 3.1 also in view of Complainant's statement of 18 February 2026 that it apparently agrees with the transfer.

Although it is not a requirement under section 4.10 of WIPO Overview 3.1, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a prima facie case that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's INWX trademark, that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

In these circumstances the Panel directs that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant based on Respondent's unilateral consent to transfer.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **inwxdomain.com**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Dinant T.L. Oosterbaan** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-10

Publish the Decision