ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

typeguard, inc. v. Narendra Ghimire
Case No. DAI2026-0029

1. The Parties

Complainant is typeguard, inc. dba Glide, United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

Respondent is Narendra Ghimire, United States, represented by John Berryhill, Ph.D., Esq., United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <glide.ai> is registered with Deep Vision Architects (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 28, 2026. On April 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 9, 2026. Respondent requested a four-day extension in accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(b), and the due date was extended until June 13, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on June 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Frederick M. Abbott, W. Scott Blackmer, and Nick J. Gardner as panelists in this matter on June 30, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of the Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

Complainant is a corporation organized in the State of Delaware, United States, with offices in Tiburon, California, United States. Complainant develops and makes available no code and low code software services for developers of business software. Complainant launched the initial version of its software platform in February 2019. Complainant operates its principal commercial website at the domain name <glideapps.com>. Complainant launched what it refers to as an "AI product line" in October 2023. That product is accessible at the URL <glideapps.com/ai>.

Complainant indicates that it has over 10,000 paying customers and is generating over USD 10 million in annual recurring revenue. Complainant reports 20,000 followers on LinkedIn, 30,000 subscribers on YouTube, 4900 followers on Instagram and 24,000 followers on X. Complainant states that a substantial number of businesses worldwide have "trusted" it. Complainant notes that Y-Combinator (a technology venture capital firm and accelerator) backed it as a start-up.

Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of registration of the word service mark GLIDE on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, registration number 5,896,557, registration dated October 29, 2019, in International Class (IC) 42, covering "Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software development tools for allowing users to create customized software applications for their own purposes utilizing cloud-based spreadsheets". Complainant also is owner of an International Trademark registration under the Madrid System, registration number 1783820, registration dated February 2, 2024, in IC 42, with grants of protection in Australia, Brazil, Canada, Indonesia, Israel, India, Japan, Mexico, and Thailand, and with other requests for protection in designated countries pending.[1] Complainant also holds a trademark registration (number 019197883, registered on October 4, 2025) for GLIDE APPS at the European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), and for GLIDE APPS at the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office (UK IPO) (UK00004213945, registered on September 19, 2025).

According to the Registrar's verification, Respondent is owner of registration for the disputed domain name. According to the WhoIs report, the record of registration of the disputed domain name was created on December 15, 2017. According to Respondent, it acquired the disputed domain name in a competitive auction in January 2021 conducted by the then-manager of the .ai country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD").

Since it acquired the disputed domain name in 2021, Respondent has made the disputed domain name available for public sale through GoDaddy's domain name brokerage service. That service is conducted on an offer and acceptance basis. On March 23, 2026, Complainant requested the broker to transmit an opening offer of USD 103,750 to the domain name registrant, the identity of which was unknown to Complainant. Complainant included a note to the broker stating "We're hopeful the owner will counteroffer so we can begin negotiations". Respondent rejected that anonymous offer and did not make a counteroffer. Complainant has provided an undated screenshot from GoDaddy showing the "minimum offer" for the disputed domain name as CAD 1,061,891.52 (approximately USD 700,000).

Complainant has noted that Respondent has been the respondent in several UDRP disputes, referencing: *Virtuoso, Ltd. v. Narendra Ghimire, Deep Vision Architects*, WIPO Case No. DIO2022-0049; *Amadeus IT Group, S.A. v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Narendra Ghimire, Deep Vision Architects*, WIPO Case No. DCO2022-0040; *Sage Global Services Limited v. Narendra Ghimire, Deep Vision Architects*, WIPO Case No. DAI2023-0010; *Abnormal Security Corporation v. Narendra Ghimire,* NAF Claim No. FA2405002099733; *All Star C.V., Converse, Inc. v. Narendra Ghimire,* WIPO Case No. DCO2024-0014; and *Themis Solutions Inc. v. Narendra Ghimire / Deep Vision Architects*, NAF Claim No. FA2502002139218. While Complainant did not affirmatively state that the complaining party had succeeded in each of these cases, it failed to disclose that in four of the listed cases the Respondent in this case prevailed (i.e., *Amadeus IT Group, S.A. v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Narendra Ghimire, Deep Vision Architects*, WIPO

---

[1]Complainant has provided a table listing of registrations other than for the United States. The Panel Chair confirmed Madrid System status by visit to the WIPO Madrid Monitor on July 4, 2026.

Case No. DCO2022-0040 [albeit with a dissenting opinion in favor of Complainant]; *Sage Global Services Limited v. Narendra Ghimire, Deep Vision Architects*, WIPO Case No. DAI2023-0010; *Abnormal Security Corporation v. Narendra Ghimire* , NAF Claim No. FA2405002099733; and *Themis Solutions Inc. v. Narendra Ghimire / Deep Vision Architects*, NAF Claim No. FA2502002139218). Respondent has referred to two additional cases (*StayinFront, Inc. v. Narendra Ghimire / Deep Vision Architects*, NAF Claim Number FA2509002177628, and *Sonata Software Limited v. Narendra Ghimire, Deep Vision Architects*, WIPO Case No. DAI2023-0051) in which Respondent prevailed.

Respondent has provided a list of 28 additional domain names in the .ai ccTLD registry incorporating dictionary terms that it states are part of its portfolio: <soar.ai>, <jaunt.ai>, <meander.ai>, <saunter.ai>, <veer.ai>, <afloat.ai>, <scurry.ai>, <circulate.ai>, <embark.ai>, <hop.ai>, <transcend.ai>, <flutter.ai>, <ferry.ai>, <flyway.ai>, <journeys.ai>, <forward.ai>, <drifter.ai>, <soaring.ai>, <circulate.ai>, <commute.ai>, <circling.ai>, <jogger.ai>, <roamer.ai>, <jumpstart.ai>, <flyover.ai>, <adrift.ai>, <mariner.ai>, <wingspan.ai>.

Respondent has provided an extensive listing of trademark registrations from around the world using the term “glide”. This includes 26 registrants in the United States using the trademark term of which at least eight relate to software or online technology, including those owned by Glide Labs, Inc., Glide LLC and Glide Software Inc. There are 199 pending or registered trademarks globally using the single term “GLIDE”, including those registered by major multinational companies and companies involved in software and technology.

Respondent has provided evidence that the term “glide” is used in the domain names of a range of businesses, including:

<Glide.com> - the home of automated services for real estate transactions;
<Glide.design> - a software development consultancy;
<Glide.dev> - a Texas web development agency;
<Glide.earth> - a booking system for AI-guided Tesla test rides;
<Glide.fit> - a Japanese vehicle business;
<Glide.health> - a “revenue intelligence” system “leveraging machine learning” to improve medical practice insurance claim submissions;
<Glide.host> - a web hosting company;
<Glide.link> - a blockchain token exchange system;
<Glide.paris> - a Parisian ride booking service;
<Glide.co.uk> - a United Kingdom optical fiber broadband service;
<Glide.com.au> - a handicapped mobility provider; and
<Glide.co> - a cryptocurrency and foreign currency exchange.

There is no evidence on the record of this proceeding of any affiliation, commercial or otherwise, between Complainant and Respondent.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it owns rights in the service mark GLIDE and that the disputed domain name is effectively identical to that service mark.

Complainant argues that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) the disputed domain name has been passively held and listed for sale since its registration; (2) Respondent is a domain investor with no known trademark rights, business entity or commercial presence associated with the term “glide”; (3) Respondent has a documented history of acquiring dictionary-word domains for resale and has been a respondent in multiple prior UDRP proceedings, consistent with a business model of acquiring domain names for speculative resale rather than legitimate commercial use; (4) Respondent is not making noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name; (5) Respondent’s asking price for the disputed domain name cannot be justified by the generic value of the term “glide” and can only be plausibly premised on extracting brand equity built up by Complainant over seven years of operation; (6) the disputed domain name is not being used for commentary, criticism, fan activity or any other purpose that could constitute fair use.

Complainant alleges that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith because: (1) Respondent has offered the disputed domain name for sale since its initial acquisition indicating that its sole intent for acquisition was commercial resale; (2) Complainant made an offer for acquiring the disputed domain name that substantially exceeded Respondent’s acquisition costs, and Respondent offered no explanation for its rejection and did not make a counteroffer. Respondent subsequently indicated an asking price exceeding USD 1 million, which could only be premised on brand equity built by Complainant, a “globally recognized software company generating over [USD] 10 million in annual revenue, trusted by more than 10,000 businesses worldwide”. This asking price can only be rationalized by bad faith intent in registering the disputed domain name with intent to resell it to Complainant; (3) Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names in order to prevent trademark owners from reflecting their marks in corresponding domain names, referring to various dispute decisions (see Factual Background, supra); (4) Respondent’s repeated and systematic acquisition of domain names corresponding to the names of established technology and software companies with the .ai ccTLD constitutes a deliberate strategy of targeting trademark owners; (5) Respondent renewed registration of the disputed domain name in September 2024 with knowledge of Complainant’s trademark rights and the factors listed above constitutes bad faith, and (6) Respondent’s passive holding of the disputed domain name where there is no plausible good faith use without infringing Complainant’s rights constitutes bad faith.

Complainant has summarized its perspective on this case, stating:

“Since its launch, Glide AI has become the most widely adopted feature set in the product’s history. The existence of a dedicated, commercially active product line operating under the GLIDE AI name, combined with the broader positioning as an AI-powered business software platform, makes the Respondent’s ownership of the domain <glide.ai> particularly harmful.

Internet users searching for Glide’s AI products and services would naturally and reasonably expect to find them at glide.ai, and the Respondent’s continued holding of that domain for speculative resale directly obstructs Glide’s ability to consolidate its brand identity in the AI space under its own name.”

Complainant requests the Panel to direct the Registrar to transfer the disputed domain name to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Respondent acknowledges that Complainant’s United States trademark registration in 2019 satisfies the first criterion under the Policy to establish rights in a trademark. Respondent notes that the services enumerated do not mention AI, and that the specimen of use submitted to the USPTO demonstrated a system for converting spreadsheet functionality into apps. Respondent notes that Complainant first used its trademark in connection with AI in May-June 2023. Complainant states that “Glide AI” was publicly launched in October 2023. This entry into the field of AI postdates Respondent’s acquisition of the disputed domain name. A March 5, 2026, posting by Complainant indicated that it introduced “Glide, built for the AI age”, on March 5, 2026.

In the United States alone in addition to Complainant there are 26 other registrants of trademarks for which GLIDE is the sole text, including registrations relating to software and online technology. Complainant cannot somehow be the sole or even most prominent contender for a claim of rights in GLIDE in relation to technology which is AI-relevant. In the international arena, there are some 199 pending or registered marks for which the sole textual component is the word “GLIDE”. As such, Complainant is one of dozens of entities in the United States and worldwide which owns trade or service marks consisting of the otherwise common dictionary word “glide”.

Regarding rights or legitimate interests, “glide” is a term most commonly used as a verb relating to moving smoothly or effortlessly. Making difficult things easy is consistent with the general appeal of AI services. Respondent lists a dozen using the term “glide”.

Respondent states that Complainant has failed to provide any evidence for the allegation that it listed the domain name at a price exceeding USD 1 million. Respondent is open to selling the domain name, but contends that Complainant should not “simply make things up”.

The public offering for sale of a dictionary word domain name can constitute a legitimate interests in the absence of circumstances indicating that Complainant in particular was targeted by such offer. Complainant claims to be aware of Respondent’s UDRP cases, “but does not seem to comprehend their outcomes”. Complainant refers to several cases in which Respondent in this case prevailed with the panel holding that purchasing and selling generic or descriptive domain names was a bona fide offering under the circumstances. Respondent notes that Complainant’s service mark is neither famous nor prominent, notwithstanding its use or recognition. Complainant’s implicit false claim that the referenced decisions were decided against Respondent is a “deceptive stunt”. Respondent notes that it has been unsuccessful in two cases, but this does not constitute a pattern of conduct. Respondent adds: “[w]hile the Complainant does not appear to be professionally represented, that is not an excuse for ignoring the plain English language of the cited decisions. It is also not an excuse to rely on an AI-generated list of cases and not actually check the outcomes, if that is what occurred here”.

Respondent operates a consistent business as a domain investor including its impressive portfolio of dictionary word domain names relating to the general concept of movement or locomotion, like “glide” (see list in Factual Background, supra).

Respondent alleges that it has made no infringing or illegitimate use of the disputed domain name, or used it for any purpose within the scope of Complainant’s rights.

The legitimate market in generic domain names may disadvantage owners of rights in arbitrary marks based on dictionary terms, but this is a feature, not a bug, of the graduated scale of trademark distinctiveness, and the UDRP requirement to prove intentional bad faith cybersquatting. Complainant will never have a monopoly in any and all commercial uses of the dictionary word “glide”.

Respondent has a well-established record of registering and offering dictionary word domain names for public sale, and Complainant has offered no evidence that Respondent lacked rights or legitimate interests to do so in respect to “glide”.

With respect to “bad faith”, Respondent notes that it acquired the disputed domain name in January 2021 when Complainant’s advertised services had nothing to do with the use of AI, so that Respondent’s acquisition could not have been predicated on any use of artificial intelligence associated with Complainant’s trademark, which Complainant admitted it introduced two years later in 2023. The UDRP requires that Complainant show registration of the disputed domain name was premised on Complainant’s mark in particular.

Complainant’s allegations principally are an assertion that attempting to sell a dictionary term domain name is per se illegitimate, which is inconsistent with the weight of authority in relation to this type of UDRP proceeding.

It is a requirement of the Policy to show that the offer for sale of a disputed domain name is to the specific trademark owner or a competitor, which would require Respondent to know with whom it was negotiating. Complainant admits to having made an anonymous six-figure offer, yet subsequently claiming that respondent was seeking something "excessive". And, Complainant indicated it was open to further negotiation. Complainant offers no basis for asserting that its offer of USD 103,500 was reasonable, but that some unstated figure in a counteroffer would be an excessive bad faith price. Complainant pursued this action against Respondent without actual evidence of abusive registration premised on its trademark.

UDRP panels long ago rejected renewal of registration of a domain name as the equivalent of a new registration for purposes of the Policy.

Understanding that Complainant may have proceeded pro se in filing its Complaint in this case, it has otherwise shown itself to be familiar with professional counsel, and in any case had a duty to proceed carefully. Emblematic of its lack of due diligence, two of the panelists nominated by Complainant for this three-person panel (one serving here) had denied complaints against Respondent. As a consequence of Complainant's lack of diligence, Respondent has incurred substantial inconvenience and expense.

Respondent asserts that Complainant has failed to demonstrate registration and use in bad faith.

Respondent requests the Panel to find against Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. 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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the service mark GLIDE for the purposes of the Policy.[2] WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The use by Respondent of the .ai ccTLD in the present circumstances does not affect the Panel's determination that the disputed domain name is identical to Complainant's service mark. The Panel notes, however, that Complainant appears to rely on the .ai ccTLD in the disputed domain name for its assertion that Respondent has taken unfair advantage of its service mark rights in GLIDE.

Respondent has acknowledged Complainant's rights in the GLIDE service mark.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

---

[2]Complainant has also alleged rights in the service mark GLIDE APPS. As the Panel determines that the disputed domain name is identical to Complainant's GLIDE service mark for purposes of the policy, the Panel, without prejudice, does not make any determinations regarding GLIDE APPS.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

The Panel does not consider Complainant to have established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel does not deem Complainant to have satisfied the second element under the Policy.

Complainant has argued that because Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with an active website and has offered the disputed domain name for public sale it has engaged in abusive passive holding of the disputed domain name. Complainant has also argued that because Respondent has engaged in a consistent practice of registering dictionary terms and offering them for sale, that Respondent is engaged in a speculative business practice rather than legitimate commercial use. Respondent has referred to a number of decisions under the Policy involving Respondent, clearly implying that previous determinations have been adverse to Respondent’s business model, while the preponderance of determinations regarding Respondent have been in its favor. Complainant also suggests that Respondent’s rejection of its substantial offer for purchase of the disputed domain name, without making a counteroffer, and with its domain broker subsequently listing a higher minimum offer, must have been designed to extract Complainant’s brand equity.

It is common ground among UDRP panels that there is nothing inherently wrongful in the business of purchasing and selling domain names. The business of the “domainers” is substantial and it is actively facilitated by major registrars, such as GoDaddy in this instance. The Panel cannot discern from where Complainant derived the idea that registering “dictionary terms” and offering them for sale is illegitimate because it is “speculative”. This is a long-standing business model.

Complainant has presented no evidence to suggest that Respondent was targeting or seeking to take advantage of Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name incorporating a common dictionary term and placing it in the .ai ccTLD space. And, importantly, Complainant’s suggestion that Respondent registered the disputed domain name using the .ai ccTLD because it was seeking to take advantage of Complainant when the disputed domain name was registered by Respondent three years before Complainant, by its own evidence, introduced an AI-related product does not by itself support the conclusion Complainant wishes the Panel to draw.

Complainant’s suggestion that Respondent was somehow seeking to take advantage of its service mark rights is predicated on its suggestion that Complainant’s service mark is “well-known”, and that because of this well-known character Respondent must effectively have been targeting Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name. The Panel rejects Complainant’s suggestion that its service mark is so well known. Complainant has provided evidence that it may have passed the initial start-up phase for a Silicon Valley venture and has reached asserted revenues of USD 10 million per year but these are current figures and there is little detail about is activities over time. Making reference to the names of venture capital aggregators like Y-Combinator does not transpose Y-Combinator’s “brand” to Complainant and its products.

Complainant’s service mark was registered in the United States in 2019, but its registrations and applications for registration for an International Trademark (and others) are significantly more recent (the International Trademark registration was accepted at WIPO in 2024, and corresponding national registrations were subsequent to that). The fact that Complainant presently has a reasonable number of subscribers on YouTube and followers on LinkedIn does not establish Complainant’s service mark as “well-known”.

Further undercutting Complainant's assertion that its brand is well known is the number of other businesses using the identical GLIDE term as a single trademark or service mark identifier. Complainant has provided no basis for the Panel to conclude that an Internet user would associate the term GLIDE with it as compared to the myriad other businesses using the same trademark term. As of 2026, most businesses in the United States if not worldwide are seeking to associate themselves with AI. The record does not establish that Complainant has a special niche as a software or service provider that distinguishes it from other "glide" and "glide"-formative businesses that have an interest in AI-related branding.

For comparison, where Respondent was unsuccessful in an earlier UDRP decision, the domain name at issue involved the trademark term "CONVERSE", which brand identifies one of the leading producers and distributors of athletic wear worldwide, including its iconic line of athletic shoes (*All Star C.V., Converse, Inc. v. Narendra Ghimire*, WIPO Case No. DCO2024-0014). The distinction between the well-known character of the CONVERSE trademark and the relatively recently introduced GLIDE service mark of Complainant reinforces the barrier that Complainant has failed to overcome to establish the well-known character of its trademark.

Complainant's posture in this proceeding can be summarized by its perspective that: "The existence of a dedicated, commercially active product line operating under the GLIDE AI name, combined with the broader positioning as an AI-powered business software platform, makes the Respondent's ownership of the domain <glide.ai> particularly harmful." … Respondent's ownership of the disputed domain name "obstructs Glide's ability to consolidate its brand identity".

Complainant is additionally arguing that it has a "better" use for the disputed domain name than Respondent or some other "glide-formative" business that might like to have its name associated with AI. The UDRP was not designed to redress Complainant's regret at not owning its preferred domain name.

Complainant bears the burden of demonstrating that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant has failed to demonstrate that Respondent did not have a legitimate interest in acquiring the disputed domain name with the intent to resell it at a price the market would bear.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent acquired the disputed domain name incorporating the common dictionary term GLIDE with the .ai ccTLD in 2021. At the time it acquired the disputed domain name, Complainant had registered the GLIDE service mark in the field of providing "temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software development tools for allowing users to create customized software applications for their own purposes utilizing cloud-based spreadsheets". In 2021 when Respondent acquired the disputed domain name, Complainant had not entered the field of AI. Assuming Respondent had some duty to investigate the trademark status of the disputed domain name at the time it registered it – bearing in mind the representation in registering a domain name not to infringe third party rights, an awareness of Complainant's service mark would not have foreclosed it from concluding that it could use the single term "glide" for commercial activities that did not involve Complainant, or for other purposes. Complainant was not, based on the evidence before the Panel, a well-known brand in 2021 so as to charge Respondent with knowledge of Complainant such that the latter was being targeted in bad faith.

While it has produced evidence of its sales, these seem to be mostly related to the immediate past, and there is little to no detail about Complainant's size and reach and revenues when the disputed domain name was acquired by Respondent; in sum: Complainant has not provided evidence to persuade the Panel that Respondent targeted Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name.

Complainant made an anonymous offer for the disputed domain name to Complainant in the amount of USD 103,500 for the disputed domain name, with an indication that it was prepared to negotiate. Respondent rejected that offer without any knowledge of the identity of Complainant. Assume for the sake of argument that Respondent subsequently instructed Go Daddy to set a minimum bid for the disputed domain name at CAD 1,061,891.52 (approximately USD 700,000). This suggests that, if Respondent was flexible, it might have anticipated a renewed offer from Complainant somewhere between USD 103,500 and 700,000, perhaps USD 400,000 for the sake of argument. And if Respondent was inflexible and would only accept USD 700,000, that does not strike the Panel as an amount that would be excessive in relation to an opening offer of USD 103,500. In any case, UDRP panels are not pricing boards or price arbitrators. The market sets the price. If a brand is well known a demand for a seemingly "excessive" price might suggest that the seller was seeking to take advantage of the particular trademark owner, but in this case the service mark is not well-known (or at least was not when Respondent acquired the disputed domain name) according to the evidence provided. Respondent may consider the disputed domain name to have a high value precisely because of the many potential users of the "glide" term, as evidenced by the many businesses using "glide" in their business or product names; Complainant argues that its current financials make it the target, but does not provide evidence of the financials of other users to support its proposition.

Respondent is passively holding the disputed domain name in the sense that it has not made use of it in connection with an active website nor in the sense of making good faith preparations for an offering of goods or services. However, for a finding of abusive passive holding, the trademark or service mark owner must demonstrate that the domain name registrant, here Respondent, has sought to take advantage of that service mark owner. One way for a complaining party to demonstrate that is to show that the trademark or service mark is a well-known brand and effectively that it is unlikely that the registrant could have had any other party in mind when it registered the disputed domain name, such that it is implausible that the party undertaking the registration would have a good faith use for the disputed domain name. In the present case, the disputed domain name is not well-known according to the evidence presented and there are other good faith uses to which the term "glide" might plausibly be put without interfering with rights held by Complainant.

The fact that Complainant's service mark is a dictionary term used by many parties other than Complainant for their businesses, and is in more general public use, is relevant. A "dictionary term" may be well-known and entitled to a high level of protection as a trademark or service mark and may be the subject of a finding of abusive passive holding. The typology of the trademark term is not determinative, even if establishing a dictionary term as a well-known brand may entail more effort than needed for an inherently distinctive term. But here, Complainant has not met the standard of a well-known brand using a dictionary term.

There is no other evidence that Respondent specifically targeted Complainant when it registered and offered for sale the disputed domain name. The fact that Respondent may have raised the asking price after Complainant made its first offer is immaterial. Respondent is entitled to extract the market value of the disputed domain name which it feels warranted. Respondent is not required to lower the price of the disputed domain name because Complainant would very much like to have it.

It is well settled that renewing registration of a domain name does not constitute a new registration for purposes of applying the bad faith criterion of the Policy. The Panel need not belabor this point.

Complainant's reference to a substantial number of cases in which Respondent did not prevail as evidence that Respondent acted here in bad faith is not dispositive. Respondent deals in a volume of domain names, and each dispute must still be assessed on its merits.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.16.

The Panel finds that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith and constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH").

Respondent has not specifically sought a finding of RDNH against Complainant.

The Panel appreciates, as Respondent has suggested, that Complainant may here be represented by an internal employee who is not necessarily an attorney.

Even taking this into account, Complainant proceeded to file its Complaint on grounds principally that it is the owner of a well-known mark, when its mark did not satisfy the criteria of a well-known mark at least at the time the disputed domain name was acquired, and that Respondent specifically attempted to take unfair advantage of Complainant by registering the dictionary term constituting Complainant's trademark in the .ai ccTLD well before Complainant's introduced an AI product, implying that Respondent should have foreseen Complainant's evolution of its services line.

Importantly, Complainant either reviewed the earlier cases involving Respondent in similar contexts and elected not to disclose the outcomes in its Complaint, or perhaps listed the decisions without reviewing them. In either case, the failure to act responsibly in filing its Complaint cannot be countenanced by the Panel given the burden it has imposed on Respondent in preparing and filing its Response.

Complainant by its own characterization initiated the proceeding because it believed it had a more compelling use for the disputed domain name than Respondent. The UDRP requires more than that: an actual assessment of Respondent's probable bad faith given the known circumstances.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Frederick M. Abbott/
Frederick M. Abbott
Presiding Panelist

W. Scott Blackmer
W. Scott Blackmer
Panelist

/Nick J. Gardner /
Nick J. Gardner
Panelist
Date: July 13, 2026