

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108876

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108876
Time of filing	2026-07-29 09:44:17
Domain names	eightadvisorypartners.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	EIGHT ADVISORY
--------------	----------------

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.
--------------	-------------------

Respondent

Name	Stacey Porter
------	---------------

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:

International trademark EIGHT ADVISORY registration No. 1025536 registered on September 25, 2009;

International trademark 8 ADVISORY registration No. 1050812 registered on April 21, 2010;

International trademark 8 EIGHT ADVISORY (device) registration No. 1042821 registered on April 21, 2010.

The Complainant claims to own several domain names containing the wording 'EIGHT ADVISORY', including <8advisory.com>, which was registered on July 31, 2009.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

Established in 2009, the Complainant is an advisory firm specializing in financial, strategic, and operational consulting for corporate managers, investors, and banks. In 2025, Eight Advisory had over 1,000 employees and generated a turnover of 300 million euro.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 17, 2026, and currently resolves to a website offering financial, strategic, and operational consultancy services, presenting itself under the name 'Eight Advisory Partners'.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark "EIGHT ADVISORY", and that the addition of the term "partners" is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark EIGHT ADVISORY.

The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and is not related to the Complainant's business in any way. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business dealings with, the Respondent. Furthermore, the use of a confusingly similar domain name to resolve to a competing webpage does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant claims that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant's website to its own competing website, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark for commercial gain. Furthermore, the Complainant contends that, given the distinctiveness and reputation of its trademarks in financial, strategic, and operational consulting, as well as the fact that the Respondent operates in the same business sector, it is highly improbable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant at the time of registration.

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

A) Confusing similarity

The Panel agrees with the Complainant's assertions that the addition of the term, "partners", does not prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

Consequently, the disputed domain name appears to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

B) Lack of legitimate rights or interests

The disputed domain name is a distinctive, non-descriptive name. It is unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without having the Complainant firmly in mind. The Complainant’s assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute a prima facie demonstration of absence of rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The burden of evidence therefore shifts to the Respondent to show, using tangible evidence, that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C) Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant gives sound bases for its contention that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

Firstly, owing to the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, combined with the fact that the Respondent operates in the same sector, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of said trademark. This is further evidenced by the fact that the disputed domain name redirects users to a website offering competing services. Consequently, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the Panel accepts the Complainant’s unchallenged assertion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the aim of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark.

Thirdly, owing to the circumstances of the present case, the Respondent’s use of a privacy shield registration constitutes further inference of bad faith registration.

Finally, the Respondent has not responded to nor denied any of the assertions made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. eightadvisorypartners.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Fabrizio Bedarida
------	-------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-26

Publish the Decision