



NATIONAL ARBITRATION FORUM

DECISION

Google Inc. v. Publica
Claim Number: FA0911001294447

PARTIES

Complainant is **Google Inc.** ("Complainant"), represented by **Maria F. Castellanos**, Colombia. Respondent is **Publica** ("Respondent"), Colombia.

REGISTRAR AND DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The domain name at issue is <**googuia.com**>, registered with **Godaddy.com, Inc.**

PANEL

The undersigned certifies that he or she has acted independently and impartially and to the best of his or her knowledge has no known conflict in serving as Panelist in this proceeding.

Houston Putnam Lowry, Chartered Arbitrator, as Panelist.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Complainant submitted a Complaint to the National Arbitration Forum electronically on November 13, 2009; the National Arbitration Forum received a hard copy of the Complaint on November 19, 2009.

On November 13, 2009, Godaddy.com, Inc. confirmed by e-mail to the National Arbitration Forum that the <**googuia.com**> domain name is registered with Godaddy.com, Inc. and that Respondent is the current registrant of the name. Godaddy.com, Inc. has verified that Respondent is bound by the Godaddy.com, Inc. registration agreement and has thereby agreed to resolve domain-name disputes brought by third parties in accordance with ICANN's Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy").

On November 30, 2009, a Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceeding (the "Commencement Notification"), setting a deadline of December 21, 2009 by which Respondent could file a response to the Complaint, was transmitted to Respondent via e-mail, post and fax, to all entities and persons listed on Respondent's registration as technical, administrative and billing contacts, and to postmaster@googuia.com by e-mail.

Having received no response from Respondent, the National Arbitration Forum transmitted to the parties a Notification of Respondent Default.

On December 29, 2009, pursuant to Complainant's request to have the dispute decided by a single-member Panel, the National Arbitration Forum appointed Houston Putnam Lowry, Chartered Arbitrator, as Panelist.

Having reviewed the communications records, the Administrative Panel (the "Panel") finds that the National Arbitration Forum has discharged its responsibility under Paragraph 2(a) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules") "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to Respondent." Therefore, the Panel may issue its decision based on the documents submitted and in accordance with the ICANN Policy, ICANN Rules, the National Arbitration Forum's Supplemental Rules and any rules and principles of law that the Panel deems applicable, without the benefit of any response from Respondent.

RELIEF SOUGHT

Complainant requests that the domain name be transferred from Respondent to Complainant.

PARTIES' CONTENTIONS

A. Complainant makes the following assertions:

Complainant, Its Business and Its Mark

1. Google is a Delaware corporation located in Mountain View, California.
2. Google was created in 1997 by Stanford Ph.D. candidates Larry Page and Sergey Brin. Since that time, Google has become one of the largest, most highly recognized, and widely used Internet search services in the world. Google's primary website is located at www.google.com.
3. Currently, the GOOGLE search engine maintains one of the largest collections of searchable documents in the world. The GOOGLE search engine provides an easy-to-use interface, advanced search technology, and a comprehensive array of search tools, and allows Internet users to search for and find a wide variety of content in many different languages.
4. Google's website is one of the most popular destinations on the Internet. For example, comScore has ranked Google as the most visited group of websites in the world. Further, Nielsen's NetRatings has ranked Google's search engine as the number one search engine for each of the months of October, November and December 2008, in each case with over 50 percent of searches.
5. Google has consistently been honored for its technology and its services, and has received numerous industry awards, including awards dating from 1998.
6. Google also offers co-branded web search solutions and has hundreds of thousands of publishers in its content network.

7. In addition to being accessible from desktop PCs, Google's adaptable, highly scalable search technology can also be accessed from most mobile and wireless platforms.
8. Google also offers a wide range of other products and services besides search. A full list of available products and services can be found at <http://www.google.com/intl/en/options/>.
9. The GOOGLE Mark identifies Google's award-winning, proprietary, and unique search services, search engine technology, and associated products and services. The GOOGLE Mark has been widely promoted among members of the general consuming public since 1997, and has exclusively identified Google. As a result, the GOOGLE Mark and name symbolize the tremendous goodwill associated with Google and are property rights of incalculable value. Due to widespread and substantial international use, this mark and name have become famous.
10. Google owns numerous United States and foreign registrations for the GOOGLE Mark (the "Registrations"). Each Registration remains valid and in full force.

Registrant, Its Activities and Its Registration of the Domain Name

11. Registrant is an entity who claims to be located in Itagui, Bogota, Colombia, South America. However, please note that, as per the information found at the WHOIS database, the street address provided by Registrant to the Registrar of the domain does not actually exist, as evidenced in the report from the Courier service.
12. Registrant registered the Domain Name on 28 August, 2007.
13. The Domain Name currently resolves to a website that imitated Complainant's website.

Efforts to Resolve This Matter

14. Google has exchanged the following communications with Registrant in an effort to have the Domain Name transferred from Registrant to Google:
 - On June 25, 2009, acting on behalf of Google, Inc., we sent a cease and desist letter to the street address found at the WHOIS database, as well as to the internet address arturogaciapublica@gmail.com, whereby we requested that registrant immediately transferred the domain to Google, Inc.
 - Please note that the letter sent to the street address was not delivered since the address does not exist, as informed by the courier service.
 - Even though the communication sent by email did not bounce, we did not receive a response from registrant.
 - On October 19, 2009, acting on behalf of Google, Inc., we sent a new cease and desist letter to the new street address found at the WHOIS database, as well as to the internet address

arturogaciapublica@gmail.com, whereby we requested once more that registrant immediately transferred the domain to Google, Inc.

- Please note that the letter sent to this new street address was not delivered, since the address does not exist, as informed by the courier service.
- Even though the communication sent by email did not bounce, we did not either receive a response from registrant.

Legal Grounds

Likelihood of Confusion

15. Google has used the GOOGLE Mark continuously since well prior to August 28, 2007, the registration date for the Domain Name. Google owns various U.S. registrations issued prior to, or resulting from applications filed prior to, August 28, 2007. Each remains valid and in full force. Thus, Complainant has rights in the GOOGLE Mark that predate the registration date of the Domain Name. See, e.g., Google Inc. v. Smith Smithers, FA0610000826563 (Nat. Arb. Forum Dec. 7, 2006) (“Although [r]espondent’s registration of the [disputed domain names] predate [sic] Complainant’s USPTO registration, Complainant’s filing date of September 16, 1998 predates [r]espondent’s registration [which] sufficiently establishes rights in the GOOGLE Mark”) (re googlevideo.com, googlevideos.com, googlemovie.com, googlemovies.com, googleforums.com and googlewebmaster.com domain names).

16. The Domain Name is “nearly identical or confusingly similar” to Complainant’s GOOGLE Mark. Minor alterations or misspellings do not eliminate the confusingly similar aspects of the Domain Name and Complainant’s mark. See Google Inc. v. Buenav Vista LLC, FA0901001243912 (Nat’l Arb. Forum Mar. 10, 2009) (finding a disputed domain that contains a misspelled version of complainant’s mark to be confusingly similar) (re googl.com domain name); see also Valpak Direct Mktg. Sys., Inc. v. Manila Indus., Inc., D2006-0714 (WIPO Aug. 17, 2006) (finding the <vallpak.com> domain name to be confusingly similar to the VALPAK mark under Policy ¶4(a)(i)). Here, the Domain Name is www.googuia.com, which reproduces four (4) of the six (6) letters found in the GOOGLE mark; therefore, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s mark.

As such, the Domain Name is nearly identical, and certainly confusingly similar, to the GOOGLE Mark.

No Rights or Legitimate Interests

17. As Panels have noted, any “[r]espondent would be hard pressed to show that it had rights or legitimate interests in the domain name because Complainant’s [GOOGLE] mark is so well known.” Google Inc. v. Mikel M Frieje, FA011000102609 (Nat. Arb. Forum Jan. 11, 2002) (re googlesex.com domain name). Registrant has not been authorized by Complainant to register or use the Domain Name.

18. The Domain Name resolves to a website that substantially imitates Complainant’s website. Specifically, the domain name www.googuia.com gives access to a website with the same design

and structure used by website www.google.com, with the purpose of rendering search engine services. Such use is neither a *bona fide* offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. See, e.g., Nat'l Westminster Bank plc v. Blues, FA731824 (Nat. Arb. Forum Aug 7, 2006) (“Respondent is using the disputed domain name to divert Internet users attempting to locate Complainant’s website to a website that is a fraudulent imitation of Complainant’s website...such diversion via an imitation website as an attempt by Respondent to pass itself off as Complainant is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services under [the Policy]; Coutts & Company v. Mr. Philip Mano, FA0902001247305 (Nat. Arb. Forum Apr. 1, 2009) (“Respondent’s attempt to capitalize on Complainant’s well known mark by attracting Internet users to its website, imitating Complainant’s genuine website and soliciting personal information, does not constitute a use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services pursuant to [the Policy] or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use pursuant to [the Policy]”).

19. Finally, Registrant has failed to comply with demands from Google regarding transfer of the Domain Name. Such failure to respond to a cease-and-desist letter indicates bad faith registration and use of a domain name. See, e.g., Encyclopedia Britannica v. Zuccarini, D2000-0330 (WIPO June 7, 2000) (failure to positively respond provides “strong support for a determination of ‘bad faith’ registration and use.”); RRI Financial, Inc., v. Chen, D2001-1242 (WIPO Dec. 11, 2001) (finding bad faith where “The Complainant alleges that it sent numerous cease and desist letters to [r]espondent without receiving a response”).

20. On information and belief, Registrant is not commonly known by the name or nickname of the Domain Name, or any name containing Complainant’s GOOGLE Mark. Registrant’s WHOIS information in connection with the Domain Name makes no mention of the Domain Name or the Mark as Registrant’s name or nickname. See, Popular Enterprises, LLC v. Sung-a Jang, FA0610000811921 (Nat. Arb. Forum Nov. 16, 2006) (“[r]espondent’s WHOIS information does not suggest that [r]espondent is commonly known by the <ntester.com> domain name”). Registrant’s name is PUBLICA.

21. Complainant has not authorized or licensed Registrant to use any of its trademarks in any way. Unlicensed, unauthorized use of domains incorporating complainant’s trademark is strong evidence that Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests. See, e.g., Time Warner Inc. v. MLM Capital LLC d/b/a Domains, FA0709001076561 (Oct. 26, 2007).

22. Thus, Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Bad Faith

23. The evidence overwhelmingly supports the conclusion that Registrant registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. First, the fame and unique qualities of the GOOGLE Mark make it extremely unlikely that the Registrant created the Domain Name independently. See, e.g., The J. Jill Group, Inc. v. John Zuccarini d/b/a RaveClub Berlin, FA0205000112627 (Nat. Arb. Forum July 1, 2002) (“Because of the famous and distinct nature of Complainant’s mark and Complainant’s J. JILL listing on the Principal Register of the USPTO, [r]espondent is thought to have been on notice as to the existence of Complainant’s mark at the time [r]espondent registered

the infringing <jjill.com> domain name. Thus, [r]espondent's registration despite this notice is evidence of bad faith registration"). Even constructive knowledge of a famous mark like GOOGLE is sufficient. Google v. Abercrombie 1, FA0111000101579 (Nat. Arb. Forum Dec. 10, 2001) ("because of the famous and distinctive nature of Complainant's GOOGLE Mark, [r]espondent is thought to have been on notice of the existence of Complainant's mark at the time [r]espondent registered the infringing [domain name]") (re googld.com domain name).

24. Second, Respondent's current use of the Domain Name to resolve to a website that imitates Complainant's website constitutes bad faith registration and use. See, e.g., Pacificherbal, LLC v. emmerse c/o lazaro remond, FA0902001246873 (Nat. Arb. Forum Apr. 6, 2009) (finding bad faith where Respondent's reproduced Complainant's entire website); Am. Int'l Group, Inc. v. Busby, FA156251 (Nat. Arb. Forum May 30, 2003) (finding bad faith where the respondent "duplicated Complainant's mark and logo, giving every appearance of being associated or affiliated with Complainant's business...to perpetrate a fraud upon individual shareholders who respected the goodwill surrounding the AIG mark").

25. Finally, Registrant has failed to comply with demands from Google regarding transfer of the Domain Name. Such failure to respond to a cease-and-desist letter indicates bad faith registration and use of a domain name. See, e.g., Encyclopedia Britannica v. Zuccarini, D2000-0330 (WIPO June 7, 2000) (failure to positively respond provides "strong support for a determination of 'bad faith' registration and use."); RRI Financial, Inc., v. Chen, D2001-1242 (WIPO Dec. 11, 2001) (finding bad faith where "The Complainant alleges that it sent numerous cease and desist letters to [r]espondent without receiving a response").

26. As shown above, Registrant has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent failed to submit a Response in this proceeding.

FINDINGS

Complainant, Google Inc., provides and maintains a search engine as well as offers e-mail and web hosting services. Complainant has operated under the GOOGLE mark since 1997. Complainant holds multiple trademarks with the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") (e.g., Reg. No. 2,954,071 issued May 24, 2005), as well as other international trademark registrations, for its GOOGLE mark.

Respondent registered the <googuia.com> domain name on August 28, 2007. Respondent's disputed domain name resolves to a website that imitates Complainant's official website located at the <google.com> domain name and offers search engine services in direct competition with Complainant.

DISCUSSION

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

In view of Respondent's failure to submit a response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(e), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations and inferences set forth in the Complaint as true unless the evidence is clearly contradictory. *See Vertical Solutions Mgmt., Inc. v. webnet-marketing, inc.*, FA 95095 (Nat. Arb. Forum July 31, 2000) (holding that the respondent's failure to respond allows all reasonable inferences of fact in the allegations of the complaint to be deemed true); *see also Talk City, Inc. v. Robertson*, D2000-0009 (WIPO Feb. 29, 2000) ("In the absence of a response, it is appropriate to accept as true all allegations of the Complaint.").

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (1) the domain name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (2) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (3) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Identical and/or Confusingly Similar

Complainant owns several trademark registrations with the USPTO for the GOOGLE mark (e.g., Reg. No. 2,954,071 issued May 24, 2005). The Panel finds Complainant has established rights in the GOOGLE mark for purposes of Policy ¶4(a)(i) through its trademark registration with the USPTO. *See AOL LLC v. Interrante*, FA 681239 (Nat. Arb. Forum May 23, 2006) (finding that where the complainant had submitted evidence of its registration with the USPTO, "such evidence establishes complainant's rights in the mark pursuant to Policy ¶4(a)(i)."); *see also Expedia, Inc. v. Emmerson*, FA 873346 (Nat. Arb. Forum Feb. 9, 2007) ("Complainant's trademark registrations with the USPTO adequately demonstrate its rights in the [EXPEDIA] mark pursuant to Policy ¶4(a)(i).").

Complainant argues that Respondent's <googuia.com> domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's GOOGLE mark pursuant to Policy ¶4(a)(i). Respondent's disputed domain name contains a misspelled version of Complainant's mark and adds the generic top-level domain ("gTLD") ".com." The Panel finds a domain name that contains a misspelled version a complainant's mark creates a confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the established mark under the facts and circumstances of this case (which includes the fact Respondent's domain name resolves to a web site which imitates Complainant's trade dress). *See Dow Jones & Co., Inc. v. Powerclick, Inc.*, D2000-1259 (WIPO Dec. 1, 2000) (holding that the deliberate introduction of errors or changes, such as the addition of a fourth "w" or the omission of periods or other such "generic" typos do not change respondent's infringement on a core

trademark held by the complainant); *see also Belkin Components v. Gallant*, FA 97075 (Nat. Arb. Forum May 29, 2001) (finding the <belken.com> domain name confusingly similar to the complainant's BELKIN mark because the name merely replaced the letter "i" in the complainant's mark with the letter "e"). In addition, the Panel finds that the addition of a gTLD is irrelevant in distinguishing a disputed domain name from an established mark. *See Trip Network Inc. v. Alviara*, FA 914943 (Nat. Arb. Forum Mar. 27, 2007) (concluding that the affixation of a gTLD to a domain name is irrelevant to a Policy ¶4(a)(i) analysis); *see also Reese v. Morgan*, FA 917029 (Nat. Arb. Forum Apr. 5, 2007) (finding that the mere addition of the generic top-level domain ".com" is insufficient to differentiate a disputed domain name from a mark). Therefore, the Panel finds that Respondent's <googuia.com> domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's GOOGLE mark pursuant to Policy ¶4(a)(i).

The Panel finds Policy ¶4(a)(i) satisfied.

Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has alleged Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant is required to produce a *prima facie* case in support of its allegations and then the burden shifts to Respondent to prove it possesses rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds Complainant has adequately established a *prima facie* case. Due to Respondent's failure to respond to these proceedings, the Panel may assume Respondent does not possess rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel, however, will examine the record to determine whether Respondent possesses rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to Policy ¶4(c). *See G.D. Searle v. Martin Mktg.*, FA 118277 (Nat. Arb. Forum Oct. 1, 2002) ("Because Complainant's Submission constitutes a *prima facie* case under the Policy, the burden effectively shifts to Respondent. Respondent's failure to respond means that Respondent has not presented any circumstances that would promote its rights or legitimate interests in the subject domain name under Policy ¶4(a)(ii)."); *see also Am. Express Co. v. Fang Suhendro*, FA 129120 (Nat. Arb. Forum Dec. 30, 2002) ("[B]ased on Respondent's failure to respond, it is presumed that Respondent lacks all rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.").

Respondent has offered no evidence, and there is no evidence in the record, suggesting Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Complainant asserts Respondent is not authorized to use the GOOGLE mark. The WHOIS information identifies registrant as "Publica." Therefore, the Panel finds Respondent has not established rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to Policy ¶4(c)(ii). *See IndyMac Bank F.S.B. v. Eshback*, FA 830934 (Nat. Arb. Forum Dec. 7, 2006) (finding that the respondent failed to establish rights and legitimate interests in the <emitmortgage.com> domain name as the respondent was not authorized to register domain names featuring the complainant's mark and failed to submit evidence of that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name); *see also St. Lawrence Univ. v. Nextnet*

Tech, FA 881234 (Nat. Arb. Forum Feb. 21, 2007) (concluding a respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name where there was no evidence in the record indicating that the respondent was commonly known by the disputed domain name).

Respondent's disputed domain name resolves to a website that imitates Complainant's official website. This imitation is referred to as "passing off." The Panel finds Respondent's attempt to pass itself off as an entity associated with Complainant is neither a *bona fide* offering of goods or services pursuant to Policy ¶4(c)(i), nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use pursuant to Policy ¶4(c)(iii). See *Dream Horse Classifieds v. Mosley*, FA 381256 (Nat. Arb. Forum Feb. 8, 2005) (finding the respondent's attempt to pass itself off as the complainant by implementing a color scheme identical to the complainant's was evidence that respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to Policy ¶4(a)(ii)); see also *Crow v. LOVEARTH.net*, FA 203208 (Nat. Arb. Forum Nov. 28, 2003) ("It is neither a bona fide offerings [sic] of goods or services, nor an example of a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under Policy ¶¶4(c)(i) & (iii) when the holder of a domain name, confusingly similar to a registered mark, attempts to profit by passing itself off as Complainant . . .").

Additionally, the website resolving from Respondent's disputed domain name offers search engine services that directly compete with Complainant's business. The Panel finds Respondent's competing use of the disputed domain name is further evidence Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See *Gardens Alive, Inc. v. D&S Linx*, FA 203126 (Nat. Arb. Forum Nov. 20, 2003) (finding that the respondent used a domain name for commercial benefit by diverting Internet users to a website that sold goods and services similar to those offered by the complainant and thus, was not using the name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use); see also *Ultimate Elecs., Inc. v. Nichols*, FA 195683 (Nat. Arb. Forum Oct. 27, 2003) (finding that the respondent's "use of the domain name (and Complainant's mark) to sell products in competition with Complainant demonstrates neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the name").

The Panel finds Policy ¶4(a)(ii) satisfied.

Registration and Use in Bad Faith

The Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name to operate a website that attempts to create the impression of being associated with Complainant and offer search engine services in direct competition with Complainant constitutes a disruption of Complainant's business and qualifies as bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy ¶4(b)(iii). See *Jerie v. Burian*, FA 795430 (Nat. Arb. Forum Oct. 30, 2006) (concluding that the respondent registered and used the <sportlivescore.com> domain name in order to disrupt the complainant's business under the LIVESCORE mark because the respondent was maintaining a website in direct

competition with the complainant); *see also* *EBAY, Inc. v. MEODesigns*, D2000-1368 (WIPO Dec. 15, 2000) (finding that the respondent registered and used the domain name <ebay.com> in bad faith where the respondent has used the domain name to promote competing auction sites).

Respondent is using the disputed domain name in order to intentionally attract Internet users to its website by creating a strong possibility of confusion with Complainant's GOOGLE mark. Respondent offers search engine services in direct competition with Complainant, which is further evidence of bad faith. Therefore, pursuant to Policy ¶4(b)(iv), the Panel finds this use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith registration and use. *See Luck's Music Library v. Stellar Artist Mgmt.*, FA 95650 (Nat. Arb. Forum Oct. 30, 2000) (finding that the respondent engaged in bad faith use and registration by using domain names that were identical or confusingly similar to the complainant's mark to redirect users to a website that offered services similar to those offered by the complainant); *see also State Fair of Tex. v. Granbury.com*, FA 95288 (Nat. Arb. Forum Sept. 12, 2000) (finding bad faith where the respondent registered the domain name <bigtex.net> to infringe on the complainant's goodwill and attract Internet users to the respondent's website).

Complainant contends Respondent is using the disputed domain name to pass itself off as Complainant by imitating the structure and layout of Complainant's official website. The Panel finds Respondent's activities constitutes passing off and is further evidence of bad faith use and registration pursuant to Policy ¶4(a)(iii). *See Monsanto Co. v. Decepticons*, FA 101536 (Nat. Arb. Forum Dec. 18, 2001) (finding that the respondent's use of <monsantos.com> to misrepresent itself as the complainant and to provide misleading information to the public supported a finding of bad faith); *see also DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Bargman*, D2000-0222 (WIPO May 29, 2000) (finding that the respondent's use of the title "Dodgeviper.com Official Home Page" gave consumers the impression that the complainant endorsed and sponsored the respondent's website).

The Panel finds Policy ¶4(a)(iii) satisfied.

DECISION

Having established all three elements required under the ICANN Policy, the Panel concludes that relief shall be **GRANTED**.

Accordingly, it is Ordered that the <googuia.com> domain name be **TRANSFERRED** from Respondent to Complainant.



Houston Putnam Lowry, Esq.
Arbitrator

Houston Putnam Lowry, Chartered Arbitrator, Panelist
Dated: January 11, 2010

[Click Here](#) to return to the main Domain Decisions Page.

[Click Here](#) to return to our Home Page

NATIONAL ARBITRATION FORUM