

## **COMPLAINT TRANSMITTAL COVERSHEET**

Attached is a Complaint that has been filed against you with the World Intellectual Property Organization (**WIPO**) Arbitration and Mediation Center (the **Center**) pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the **Policy**) approved by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (**ICANN**), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the **Rules**) approved by ICANN, and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the **Supplemental Rules**).

The Policy is incorporated by reference into your Registration Agreement with the Registrar(s) of your domain name(s), in accordance with which you are required to submit to a mandatory administrative proceeding in the event that a third party (a **Complainant**) submits a complaint to the Center, concerning a domain name that you have registered. You will find the name and contact details of the Complainant, as well as the domain name(s) that is/are the subject of the Complaint in the Complaint that accompanies this Coversheet.

Once the Center has checked the Complaint to determine that it satisfies the formal requirements of the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules, it will forward a copy of the Complaint, including annexes, to you by email as well as sending you hardcopy Written Notice by post and/or facsimile. You will then have 20 calendar days from the date of Commencement within which to submit your Response. You may request an automatic extension of 4 calendar days. You may represent yourself or seek the assistance of legal counsel to represent you in the administrative proceeding.

- The **Policy** can be found at: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/policy-2024-02-21-en>
- The **Rules** can be found at: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/udrp-rules-2024-02-21-en>
- The **Supplemental Rules**, as well as other information concerning the resolution of domain name disputes can be found at: <https://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/supplemental/eudrp/newrules.html>
- A **model Response** can be found at: <https://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/respondent/index.html>
- WIPO's **Data Privacy Notice** can be found at: <https://www.wipo.int/web/privacy-policy>

Alternatively, you may contact the Center to obtain any of the above documents. The Center can be contacted in Geneva, Switzerland by email at [domain.disputes@wipo.int](mailto:domain.disputes@wipo.int).

You are kindly requested to contact the Center to provide any alternate email address to which you would like (a) the Complaint, including Annexes and (b) other communications in the administrative proceeding to be sent.

A copy of this Complaint has also been sent to the Registrar(s) with which the domain name(s) that is/are the subject of the Complaint is/are registered.

By submitting this Complaint to the Center the Complainant hereby agrees to abide and be bound by the provisions of the Policy, Rules, Supplemental Rules, and the WIPO Data Privacy Notice.

**Before the:**

**WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION  
ARBITRATION AND MEDIATION CENTER**

**Yielder Group B.V.**  
Siriusdreef 66  
2132 WT Hoofddorp  
The Netherlands

**Allied Branding B.V.**  
Siriusdreef 66  
2132 WT Hoofddorp  
The Netherlands

**(Complainant)**

-v-

Dies Goorman  
Stadsplateau 27-29  
3521 AZ Utrecht  
The Netherlands

See Amended Section II.B below

**(Respondent)**

---

**Disputed Domain Name(s):**

1. [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com)
2. [www.yielderreviews.com](http://www.yielderreviews.com)
3. [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com)

See Section III 8 below and the attached Excel overview (Annex 1)

**COMPLAINT**

(Rules, Paragraph 3(b); Supplemental Rules, Paragraphs 4(a), 12(a), Annex E)

**I. Introduction**

- [1.] This Complaint is hereby submitted for decision in accordance with the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the **Policy**), approved by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (**ICANN**), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the **Rules**), approved by ICANN, and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the **Supplemental Rules**).

**II. The Parties**

**A. The Complainant**

(Rules, Paragraphs 3(b)(ii) and (iii))

- [2.] The Complainant in this administrative proceeding is Yielder Group B.V. and Allied Branding B.V., hereinafter together referred to as “**Yielder**”.

Allied Branding B.V. is the owner of the following trademarks (“**Trademarks**”; Annex 2):

- EU word mark “YIELDER” with registration number 018672367 and application date 15/03/2022;

- EU figurative mark “YIELDER” with registration number 018864998 and application date 20/04/2023;
- Benelux word mark “YIELDER” with registration number 1390208 and application date 11/02/2019.

Yielder Group B.V. is the sole shareholder in Allied Branding B.V. The director of Allied Branding B.V. is YGB B.V., who is also the director of Yielder Group B.V. Allied Branding B.V. is the holder of the Trademarks and Yielder Group B.V. is the operating company that holds the right to exploit the intellectual property rights held by Allied Branding B.V. Both Yielder Group B.V. and Allied Branding B.V. therefore have a common grievance against the Respondent. Yielder Group B.V. and Allied Branding B.V. therefore act jointly as Complainant.

[3.] The Complainant's contact details are:

- Yielder Group B.V.:  
 Address: Siriusdreef 66  
 2132 WT Hoofddorp  
 The Netherlands  
 Telephone: +31 174350650  
 Email: info@yieldergroup.com
- Allied Branding B.V.:  
 Address: Siriusdreef 66  
 2132 WT Hoofddorp  
 The Netherlands  
 Telephone: +31 174350650  
 Email: info@yieldergroup.com

[4.] The Complainant's authorized representative in this administrative proceeding is:

- La Gro B.V  
 Address: Prinses Margrietplantsoen 56  
 2595 BR The Hague  
 The Netherlands  
 Telephone: +31 70 7900130  
 Email: [info@lagro.com](mailto:info@lagro.com)

[5.] The Complainant's preferred method of communications in this administrative proceeding is:

- Electronic only material  
 Method: email  
 Address: [b.niemeijer@lagro.com](mailto:b.niemeijer@lagro.com); and  
[t.bodha@lagro.com](mailto:t.bodha@lagro.com)  
 Contact: mr B. Niemeijer; and  
 mr T.M. Bodha
- Material including hardcopy (where applicable)  
 Address: Prinses Margrietplantsoen 56  
 2595 BR The Hague  
 The Netherlands  
 Contact: mr B. Niemeijer; and  
 mr T.M. Bodha

**B. The Respondent**  
(Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(v))

***This section is amended based on the request of the Center in its Notice of Change – Multiple Underlying Parties, dated April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2025, to amend the Complaint by adding the Registrar-disclosed registrants as formal Respondents and to provide relevant arguments or evidence demonstrating that all named Respondents are, in fact, the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control.***

[6.] The identity of the Respondent was unknown to Complainant, because for all three domain names, the name of the holder is redacted. Complainant has submitted requests to the respective Registrars to provide the contact details of the registrant. However, none of the registrars has provided such contact details. Only after the complaint was submitted with the Center, Complainant has been provided by the Center with the Respondent's identity.

1. For the domain name 1 [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com), a request was submitted to Tucows, Inc. Tucows refused to give any registrant details and referred Complainants to the UDRP procedure. A notice-and-takedown was also sent to FlokiNET, the website hosting provider hosting the website with the infringing content, requesting not only to take down the website but also to provide the contact details of the website holder. Unfortunately, FlokiNET hides behind its statement that it serves the freedom of speech over the protection of intellectual property rights of Complainants.

Pursuant to paragraphs 4(a) and (b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the concerned Registrar identified the Registrant to the Center as:

First Name:	FlokiNET Ltd WhoisProtection
Last Name:	FlokiNET Ltd WhoisProtection
Organization Name:	FlokiNET Ltd
Street Address:	Bel Ombre Rd. P.5057
City:	Beau Vallon
State:	Mahe
2 Letter ISO Country Code:	SC
Postal Code:	N/A
Phone:	+358.942458241
Email:	<a href="mailto:abuse@flokinet.is">abuse@flokinet.is</a>

2. For domain name 2 [www.yielderreviews.com](http://www.yielderreviews.com), a request was submitted to NameSilo, LLC. NameSilo refused to give any registrant details and referred Complainants to the UDRP procedure.

Pursuant to paragraphs 4(a) and (b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the concerned Registrar identified the Registrant to the Center as:

First Name:	Dies
Last Name:	Goorman
Street Address:	Stadsplateau 27-29
Postal Code:	3521AZ
City:	Utrecht
Country:	The Netherlands
2 letter ISO Country Code:	NL
Phone:	+31.684499553
Email:	<a href="mailto:f.kuhlman88@gmail.com">f.kuhlman88@gmail.com</a>

3. For domain name 3 [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com), a request was submitted to PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com. PDR responded by referring to its online reporting form and did not give registrant details. On Whois, registrant details "Redacted, Utrecht" are shown. This, in addition to the following information, confirms the suspicion that the registrant is a Dutch individual.

Pursuant to paragraphs 4(a) and (b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the concerned Registrar identified the Registrant to the Center as:

First Name:	Dies
Last Name:	Goorman
Street Address:	Stadsplateau 27-29 Central Park
Postal Code:	3521AZ
City:	Utrecht
Country:	The Netherlands
2 letter ISO Country Code:	NL
Phone:	+31.684499553
Email:	<a href="mailto:dies.goorman88@gmail.com">dies.goorman88@gmail.com</a>

All the above correspondence with the Registrars is attached to this complaint as Annex 3.

Complainant has more than reasonable grounds to believe that the Registrar-disclosed Registrants are in fact the formal Respondent and that they are the same entity and that the domain names are under common control. Complainant substantiate such as follows.

The Whois information for the domain name [www.werkenbijyielder.nl](http://www.werkenbijyielder.nl) - which is not part of this procedure as it has already been suspended by SIDN - showed the name Dies Goorman as the Registrant. This name is also shown as the Registrar-disclosed Registrant for the domain names 2 and 3: [www.yielderreviews.com](http://www.yielderreviews.com) and [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com). Regarding the domain name 1 [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com), the identity of the Registrant is still shielded under FlokiNET Ltd's WhoisProtection.

However, the Registrant of the domain name 1 is in fact one and the same entity/person as the Registrant of the domain names 2 and 3, namely Dies Goorman. This can be concluded on the fact that the domain name 3 [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com) was used as a redirect to the domain name 1 [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com). This also shows that the domain names are/were all under common control of Dies Goorman.

Unfortunately, the name Dies Goorman cannot be linked to any existing individual who could be the holder of the domain names, and is likely to be a false name. The name, however, is Dutch, which gives reason to believe that the Respondent is a Dutch national. The fact that the content on the websites is Dutch also is a strong indication that the Respondent is a Dutch national.

[7.] All information known to the Complainant regarding how to contact the Respondent is as follows:

1. the email address [redactie@werkenbijyielder.com](mailto:redactie@werkenbijyielder.com);

Complainant has noticed on March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025, that this email address was listed via the THC Servers Global, LLC, as the contact information of the website holder. However, on March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2025, this email address was no longer active. The website [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com) was no longer online and the corresponding domain name 3 was now used as a redirect to yieldleaks.com (registered on March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2025).

2. the email address [dies.goorman88@gmail.com](mailto:dies.goorman88@gmail.com);

Complainant has noticed that the website [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com) was registered with the email address [dies.goorman88@gmail.com](mailto:dies.goorman88@gmail.com) which was linked to the email address 1. When trying to login to the account the recovery details of this email address were shown as recovery telephone number ending with \*\*\*53 and recovery email address [j06\\*\\*\\*\\*@gamil.com](mailto:j06****@gamil.com).

3. the email address [robinharko@gmail.com](mailto:robinharko@gmail.com)

Complainant has noticed a post on the website [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com) stating the name 'Robin Harko' and showing the email address [robinharko@gmail.com](mailto:robinharko@gmail.com). When trying to login to the account the recovery details of this email address were shown as recovery telephone number ending with \*\*\*47 and recovery email address [pch\\*\\*\\*\\*@gamil.com](mailto:pch****@gamil.com).

4. the email address [f.kuhlman88@gmail.com](mailto:f.kuhlman88@gmail.com)

Complainant has been provided this email address as a contact detail of Respondent in the Notice of Change – Multiple Underlying Registrants as sent by the WIPO to Complainant on April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Complainant was not aware of the existence of this email address, nor that this was a means of contact of Respondent.

Complainant is not known with any of the (recovery) email addresses and/ or (recovery) telephone numbers mentioned above. Any attempt to contact the Respondent via these email addresses has ended without any success.

If and to the extent there are more than one (1) Respondents, Complainant request the Administrative Panel to consolidate its complaint against all Respondents. It is far more than likely that the domain names are under common control based on the fact that they redirect(ed) one to the other and that once a website is no longer online immediately thereafter another website is made online under a similar domain name, at least a domain name that includes (part of) Complainant's Trademark. Also, the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties and would underpin procedural efficiency.

### **III. The Domain Name(s) and Registrar(s)**

(Rules, Paragraphs 3(b)(vi), (vii))

- [8.] This dispute concerns the domain name(s) identified below (also see Annex 1):

	1	2	3
Domain name	<a href="http://www.yielderpapers.com">www.yielderpapers.com</a>	<a href="http://www.yielderreviews.com">www.yielderreviews.com</a>	<a href="http://www.werkenbijyielder.com">www.werkenbijyielder.com</a>
Registrar	Tucows, Inc.	NameSilo, LLC	PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com
Status	clientTransferProhibited	clientTransferProhibited	clientDeleteProhibited, clientHold, clientRenewProhibited, clientTransferProhibited, clientUpdateProhibited
Registration date	7-3-2025	24-3-2025	11-2-2025
Expiry date	7-3-2026	24-3-2026	11-2-2026

- [9.] The registrar(s) with which the domain name(s) is/are registered is/are:

1. Domain name [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com):

Tucows Domains Inc.  
Attention: Compliance  
96 Mowat Avenue  
Toronto, Ontario M6K 3M1

CANADA  
<http://www.tucowsdomains.com>  
[legal@tucows.com](mailto:legal@tucows.com)

2. Domain name [www.yielderreviews.com](http://www.yielderreviews.com):

NameSilo, LLC  
390 NE 191st St STE 8437  
Miami, FL 33179  
USA  
<http://www.namesilo.com>  
[abuse@namesilo.com](mailto:abuse@namesilo.com)

3. Domain name [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com):

PDR Ltd. d/b/a/ PublicDomainRegistry.com  
5335 Gate Pkwy, 2nd Floor,  
Jacksonville, FL 32256,  
USA  
<http://www.publicdomainregistry.com>  
[abuse-contact@publicdomainregistry.com](mailto:abuse-contact@publicdomainregistry.com)

#### **IV. Language of Proceedings** (Rules, Paragraph 11)

- [10.] Complainant request that the language of proceedings be Dutch (Nederlands) and provide the following supporting arguments and evidence.

Complainant is not a party to any Registration Agreement regarding the domain names and is therefore not familiar with the language of those agreements. Complainant presume the language is English. The Registrars are Canadian (Tucows, Inc.), American (NameSilo) and Indian (PDR Ltd.).

However, Complainant has sufficient reason to believe that the Respondent is a Dutch national who speaks the Dutch language, as:

- the location of the Respondent is Utrecht, The Netherlands, as this information is shown in the Registrar-disclosed registrants identification (see paragraph 6, above);
- the alias used by the Respondent (Dies Goorman) is a Dutch name;
- the content on the website [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com) and [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com) is in Dutch;
- Complainant is incorporated and located in the Netherlands and the content on the website [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com) en [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com) concerns (working for) Yielder Group B.V.
- the Respondent appears to be a former employee of Complainant.

The above are all indications that the Respondent is familiar with the Dutch language. Evidence is annexed as Annex 4.

#### **V. Jurisdictional Basis for the Administrative Proceeding** (Rules, Paragraphs 3(a), 3(b)(xiv))

- [11.] This dispute is properly within the scope of the Policy and the Administrative Panel has jurisdiction to decide the dispute. The registration agreement, pursuant to which the domain name(s) that is/are the subject of this Complaint is/are registered, incorporates the Policy. A true and correct copy of the domain name dispute policy that applies to the domain names in question is provided as Annex 5 to this Complaint and can be found

1. for domain name 1 yelderpapares.com at:

[https://opensrs.com/wp-content/uploads/Master\\_Domain\\_Registration\\_Agreement.html?\\_hstc=126717202.e1316ada04cae129d2acbd6315a609b6.1743517925213.1743521342061.1744706987652.3&\\_hssc=126717202.2.1744706987652&\\_hsfp=920805383](https://opensrs.com/wp-content/uploads/Master_Domain_Registration_Agreement.html?_hstc=126717202.e1316ada04cae129d2acbd6315a609b6.1743517925213.1743521342061.1744706987652.3&_hssc=126717202.2.1744706987652&_hsfp=920805383);

2. for domain name 2 yelderreviews.com at:

<https://www.namesilo.com/support/v2/articles/general-terms/terms-and-conditions>; and

3. for domain name 3 werkenbijyelder.com at:

<https://publicdomainregistry.com/legal/#dra>

## **VI. Factual and Legal Grounds**

(Policy, Paragraphs 4(a), (b), (c); Rules, Paragraph 3)

[12.] This Complaint is based on the following grounds:

**A. The domain name(s) is(are) identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;**

(Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(i); Rules, Paragraphs 3(b)(viii), (b)(ix)(1))

Complainant invokes the registered Trademarks as listed in Annex 2:

- EU word mark “YELDER” with registration number 018672367 and application date 15/03/2022;
- EU figurative mark “YELDER” with registration number 018864998 and application date 20/04/2023;
- Benelux word mark “YELDER” with registration number 1390208 and application date 11/02/2019.

The domain names all contain the Trademarks in full, albeit in combination with an addition before or after the Trademark. It is standard practice of the Administrative Panel in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark to conclude that the domain name is considered confusingly similar to that trademark for purposes of UDRP standing.

<b>Trademarks</b>	<b>Domain names</b>
YELDER	<a href="http://yelderpapers.com">yelderpapers.com</a> <a href="http://yelderreviews.com">yelderreviews.com</a> <a href="http://werkenbijyelder.com">werkenbijyelder.com</a>

Also, the content of the website [www.werkenbijyelder.com](http://www.werkenbijyelder.com) and [www.yelderpapares.com](http://www.yelderpapares.com) trading off Complainant’s reputation, and the pattern of multiple domain names targeting Complainant’s Trademarks within this proceeding, support the finding of confusing similarity.

In light of the foregoing, Complainant concludes that the domain names are highly confusingly similar to Complainant’s Trademarks.

**B. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name(s);**  
(Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(ii); Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(ix)(2))

Complainant’s Trademarks were registered in 2019, 2022, and 2023, and Complainant has put its Trademarks to genuine use in the relevant territories. Complainant is known under its Trademarks and uses its Trademarks also as a trade name.



Respondent has registered the domain names just a few months ago in February and March of this year, 2025, which is two (2) to six (6) years after Complainant's Trademarks were registered.

Prior to any notice to the Respondent as well as after such notice was sent to the Respondent, there is no evidence at all of any (i) business formation-related due diligence/legal advice/correspondence, (ii) credible investment in website development or promotional materials such as advertising, letterhead, or business cards, (iii) proof of a genuine business plan utilizing the domain name, and credible signs of pursuit of the business plan, (iv) bona fide registration and use of related domain names, and (v) other evidence generally pointing to a lack of indicia of cybersquatting intent.

Also, the Respondent has in no way, shape, or form been commonly known by the domain names. If any, The Respondent is most likely a former employee of Complainant as it uses the domain names to complain about Complainant and slander the good reputation of Complainant.

It is shown in the Registrar-disclosed registrant identification regarding domain name 3 [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com) that the domain name [www.yielder.org](http://www.yielder.org) is listed as a contact information. However, the whois information regarding the domain name [www.yielder.org](http://www.yielder.org) shows that the Registrant is located in Kenya, as is the company shown on the website running on said domain name (**Annex 6**). It appears that Respondent with the mentioning of this domain name [www.yielder.org](http://www.yielder.org) is misleadingly the Center and Complainant and that such mentioning of the domain name [www.yielder.org](http://www.yielder.org) in no way, shape, or form can result in any claim of rights or legitimate interest in respect of the domain names [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com), [www.yielderreviews.com](http://www.yielderreviews.com), and [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com).

Such use of the domain names by the Respondent is also not considered to be fair use under the UDRP as it is misleading to the customers and to tarnishes Complainant's Trademarks as it falsely suggests affiliation with Complainant and its Trademarks. As stated in section VI.A, the domain names incorporate the entirety of the Trademarks, albeit with an additional term.

The use of the domain names is not legitimate as illustrated below.

1. Regarding domain name 1 [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com): the domain name suggests that it holds a website that contains papers of and/or publications by Complainant and/or similar services provided by Complainant.

However, such is not the case. There was a website published under this domain name that contained alleged infringing/unrightful content about Complainant. The website has been deleted/taken offline and the domain name now redirects to another domain name [www.ictleaks.com](http://www.ictleaks.com) which holds a website with similar alleged infringing/unrightful content about Complainant. Such use can in no way, shape, or form be qualified as legitimate use. It misleads the customer as it redirects the customer to a totally different domain name with a similar website containing the same alleged infringing/unrightful content towards Complainant, tarnishing the good reputation of Complainant and its Trademarks.

2. Regarding domain name 2 [www.yielderreviews.com](http://www.yielderreviews.com): the domain name suggests that it holds a website that contains reviews published by Complainant and/or similar services provided by Complainants. Also, it might suggest that the website contains reviews about Complainant.

Similar to domain name 1, this is not the case. The domain name is now inactive, at least, access to the domain name is blocked because the domain name falls under the category Spam URLs. Such non-use is in no way, shape, or form qualified as legitimate use. It misleads the customer because it is no longer in use and it is qualified as a Spam URL tarnishing the good reputation of Complainant and its Trademarks.

3. Regarding domain name 3 [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com), it suggest that this website contains a recruitment page and/or recruitment information and/or job information and/or job opportunities published by Complainant about working at Complainant. The phrase "*werken bij*" in Dutch means "*working for/at*" in English.

However, the domain name was used as a redirect to domain name 1 and website [yielderpapers.com](http://yielderpapers.com) and is now no longer being used. Such non-use is in no way, shape, or form qualified as legitimate use. The domain name never contained any job listing at Complainant, nor did refer or redirect to an actual website where jobs (at Complainant) were listed. This domain name misleads the customer as the customer might think that there are no jobs available at Complainant or that a website held by Complainant does not function properly tarnishing the good reputation of Complainant and its Trademarks.

As per usual, the Administrative Panels will assess any claimed Respondent rights or legitimate interests in the present with a view to the circumstances prevailing at the time of the filing of the Complaint. Complainant has screenshots attached to this Complaint as [Annex 4](#), showing the current state of the use of the domain names and the website directed to at the time this Complaint is filed and thus showing that the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the domain names and that the Respondent is not making any legitimate use of the domain names.

In light of the foregoing, Complainant concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain names.

**C. The domain name(s) was/were registered and is/are being used in bad faith.**  
(Policy, paragraphs 4(a)(iii), 4(b); Rules, paragraph 3(b)(ix)(3))

The domain names are registered and used in bad faith under the UDRP because the Respondent takes unfair advantage of and otherwise abuses Complainant's Trademarks.

First, it is established by Complainant that the Respondent has registered the trademark-abusive domain names on separate occasions. A clear pattern of registration of multiple trademark-abusive domain names has been found where the Respondent registers, simultaneously or otherwise, new and/or additional trademark-abusive domain names shortly after the Respondent has been sent a notice-and-takedown request notifying the Respondent of the abusive, non-legitimate and infringing use of Complainant's Trademarks. Such pattern of registration and use in bad faith is shown by amongst others the following domain names:

- [www.werkenbijyielder.nl](http://www.werkenbijyielder.nl) (this domain name has already been suspended by the SIDN);
- [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com);
- [www.yieldleaks.com](http://www.yieldleaks.com) (no longer active);
- [www.yielderreviews.com](http://www.yielderreviews.com); and
- [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com).

By registering and using the domain names, the Respondent is unlawfully disrupting the business of Complainant. This is shown by the following particular circumstances:

- (i) the domain names all incorporate the entire Trademarks plus an additional term that has no specific reference to the Respondent;
- (ii) the domain names all have the gTLD .com;
- (iii) the content of the website [www.werkenbijyielder.com](http://www.werkenbijyielder.com) and [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com) to which the domain names direct is allegedly infringing/unlawful toward Complainant as it is unbiased, unfounded, unsubstantiated, and biased;
- (iv) the registration of the domain names have taken place just a few months ago in February and March of this year, 2025, which is two (2) to six (6) years after Complainant's Trademarks were registered. Also, follow up registrations have taken place after the domain name [www.werkenbijyielder.nl](http://www.werkenbijyielder.nl) was already suspended by the SIDN; and
- (v) there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the domain names in question.

In light of section VI.B, above, it is clear that the domain names are not being used legitimately, as they are either not accessible or used merely as a redirect. Such non-use of a domain name cannot prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Relevant factor for concluding that such passive holding is indeed qualified as use in bad faith include:

- (i) the fact that Complainant's Trademarks have a very high degree of distinctiveness;

- (ii) the factor that the Respondent fails to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use;
- (iii) the fact that the Respondent has concealed its identity and/or uses false contact details (albeit in breach of its registration agreement); and
- (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put.

Where it appears that a respondent employs a privacy or proxy service merely to avoid being notified of a UDRP proceeding filed against it, the Administrative Panel ought to find that this supports an inference of bad faith. The Administrative Panel additionally ought to view the provision of false contact information underlying a privacy or proxy service as an indication of bad faith. The Administrative Panel furthermore ought to have viewed the Respondent's use of a privacy or proxy service which is known to block or intentionally delay disclosure of the identity of the actual underlying registrant as an indication of bad faith.

In light of the foregoing, Complainant concludes that the Respondent has registered and uses the domain names in bad faith.

#### **VII. Remedies Requested** (Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(x))

- [13.] In accordance with Paragraph 4(i) of the Policy, for the reasons described in Section VI. above, the Complainant requests the Administrative Panel appointed in this administrative proceeding that the disputed domain names be cancelled.

#### **VIII. Administrative Panel** (Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(iv); Supplemental Rules, Paragraph 8(a))

- [14.] The Complainant elects to have the dispute decided by a single-member Administrative Panel.

#### **IX. Mutual Jurisdiction** (Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(xii))

- [15.] In accordance with Paragraph 3(b)(xii) of the Rules, the Complainant will submit, with respect to any challenges that may be made by the Respondent to a decision by the Administrative Panel to transfer or cancel the domain name(s) that is/are the subject of this Complaint, to the jurisdiction of the courts at the location of the domain name holder's address, as shown for the registration of the domain names in the concerned registrar's Registration Data at the time of the submission of the Complaint to the Center.

The location of the domain name holder's address is Utrecht, The Netherlands. Although the location of the holder of the domain name 1 [www.yielderpapers.com](http://www.yielderpapers.com) is still redacted in the concerned registrar's Registration Data, Complainant strongly believes that it all concerns one and the same Respondent because the content of the website is in Dutch and the domain names were used as a redirect to each other.

Furthermore, Complainant is a Dutch company, based in the Netherlands and the content posted on the websites is about (working for) Complainant. The domain name holder also appears to be a former employee of Complainant. Complainant therefore has sufficient reasons to suspect the domain name holder is a Dutch national who also resides in the Netherlands.

#### **X. Other Legal Proceedings** (Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(xi))

- [16.] There are no other legal proceedings that have yet been commenced in connection with or relating to the domain names that are the subject of the Complaint nor have any such proceedings been terminated. However, Complainant intends to start any such proceedings if and to the extent necessary.

### **XI. Communications**

(Rules Paragraph 3(b), Supplemental Rules, Paragraphs 3, 4, 12)

- [17.] This Complaint has been submitted to the Center in electronic form, including annexes, in the appropriate format.
- [18.] A copy of this Complaint has been transmitted to the concerned registrar(s) on April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2025 in electronic form in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Supplemental Rules.

### **XII. Payment**

(Rules, Paragraph 19; Supplemental Rules Paragraph 10, Annex D)

- [19.] As required by the Rules and Supplemental Rules, payment in the amount of USD 1,500 has been made by Bank Transfer.

### **XIII. Certification**

(Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(xiii); Supplemental Rules, Paragraph 15)

- [20.] The Complainant agrees that its claims and remedies concerning the registration of the domain names, the dispute, or the dispute's resolution shall be solely against the domain name holder and waives all such claims and remedies against (a) the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center and Panelists, except in the case of deliberate wrongdoing, (b) the concerned registrars, (c) the registry administrator, and (d) the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, as well as their directors, officers, employees, and agents.
- [21.] The Complainant certifies that the information contained in this Complaint is to the best of the Complainant's knowledge complete and accurate, that this Complaint is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, and that the assertions in this Complaint are warranted under the Rules and under applicable law, as it now exists or as it may be extended by a good-faith and reasonable argument.

- - -

Respectfully submitted,



Tahir M. Bodha

The Hague  
April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Date of Amended Complaint

- Section II.B;
- Section I.V;
- Section VI.B;
- Section IX; and
- Section XIV, Annex 6.

April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025

#### **XIV. List of Annexes**

(Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(xiv); Supplemental Rules, Paragraphs 4(a), 12(a), Annex E)

- [22.] The Rules provide that a Complaint or Response, including any annexes, shall be submitted electronically. Under the Supplemental Rules, there is a file size limit of 10MB (ten megabytes) for any one attachment, with an overall limit for all submitted materials of 50MB (fifty megabytes).
- [23] Other than by prior arrangement with the Center, when larger amounts of data need to be transmitted, larger files can be “split” into a number of separate files or documents each no larger than 10MB.

Annex 1: Overview of disputed domain names

Annex 2: Overview of Complainant’s trademark registrations

Annex 3: Cease and desist and notice-and-takedown letters and correspondence with registrars

Annex 4: Screenshots of Whois information and website pages

Annex 5: Domain name dispute policy applicable to the respective domain names

Annex 6: Screenshot of Whois information and website pages of [www.yielder.org](http://www.yielder.org)