

DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE

DRS 19869

Decision of Independent Expert

Craghoppers Limited

Complainant

and

Whois Foundation

Respondent

1 The Parties

Complainant:	Craghoppers Limited
Address:	Risol House Mercury Way Urmston Manchester M41 7RR United Kingdom

Respondent:	Whois Foundation
Address:	Ramon Arias Avenue Ropardi Building, Office 3-C PO Box 0823-03015 Panama City 0823 Panama

2 The Domain Names

cragghopper.co.uk

wwwcraghoppers.co.uk (collectively, the "Domain Names").

3 Procedural History

I confirm that I am independent of each of the parties. To the best of my knowledge and belief, there are no facts or circumstances, past or present, or that could arise in the foreseeable future, which need be disclosed as being of such a nature as to call into question my independence in the eyes of one or both of the parties.

16 February 2018	Dispute received
19 February 2018	Complaint validated
19 February 2018	Notification of complaint sent to parties
08 March 2018	Response reminder sent
09 March 2018	Response received
09 March 2018	Notification of response sent to parties
13 March 2018	Reply received
13 March 2018	Notification of reply sent to parties
13 March 2018	Mediator appointed
14 March 2018	Mediation started
14 March 2018	Mediation failed
14 March 2018	Close of mediation documents sent
15 March 2018	Expert decision payment received

4 Factual Background

- 4.1 The domain name *cragghopper.co.uk* (the "First Domain Name") was registered on 31 May 2017, and *wwwcraghoppers.co.uk* (the "Second Domain Name") on 5 June 2017.
- 4.2 The Complainant is an outdoor clothing manufacturer and retailer.
- 4.3 The Respondent's status is unclear.
- 4.4 The Domain Names are currently pointing to pay-per-click advertising webpages, providing links to the Complainant's website and to the websites of third parties, including competitors of the Complainant.

5 Parties' Contentions

Complaint

- 5.1 The Complainant explains that it is an outdoor clothing manufacturer and retailer, whose ultimate predecessor was founded in West Yorkshire in 1965, and that in 1995 the CRAGHOPPERS brand was acquired by the Regatta Group, also an outdoor clothing company. Its product range includes waterproof outerwear, fleeces, shorts, t-shirts and outdoor accessories, which are sold in over 100 retail outlets in the United Kingdom, as well as through a website at *www.craghoppers.com*.
- 5.2 The Complainant asserts that the Respondent "appears to be a prolific domain name squatter", being the registrant of 46,923 domain names in the .uk ccTLD. Approximately 37,000 of those domain names are exhibited to the Complaint.
- 5.3 In addition, the Complainant identifies, by way of illustration, 10 domain names registered by the Respondent which appear to be examples of 'typo-squatting' (i.e. the practice of deliberately

registering as a domain name a mis-spelled version of a well known name or mark), e.g. *bankofscotland.co.uk*, *cathkindston.co.uk* and *debehnhams.co.uk*.

- 5.4 The Complainant also points out that, as in the case of the Second Domain Name, the Respondent is the registrant of at least 474 other domain names with the prefix "www".
- 5.5 The Complainant relies on a previous decision in DRS 19551 (*hdmrc.co.uk* et al) in which this Expert made a finding that, notwithstanding that trading in domain names for profit and/or holding a large portfolio of domain names, is not, of itself, objectionable under the DRS (DRS Policy, paragraph 8.4), in that case it was plain from the evidence adduced by the complainant, HM Revenue and Customs, that the Respondent (also the Respondent in this case) was engaged in large scale registration of domain names which appeared to infringe the rights of third parties.
- 5.6 The Complainant also notes that in DRS 19551 the Respondent attempted to avoid having a decision made against it by offering to transfer the disputed domain names before an Expert was appointed. The Complainant asserts that "should the Respondent attempt to do the same in the current dispute", it nonetheless wishes the Expert to make a decision.
- 5.7 The Complainant says that at the time the Complaint was filed, the Domain Names were pointing to websites displaying pay-per-click advertisements relating to the Complainant's area of business. Those links lead to the websites of competitors of the Complainant and other third parties.
- 5.8 The Complainant relies on three registered trade marks, in each case in respect of the CRAGHOPPERS mark, as illustrative examples of what it says is a "global portfolio of registered rights relating to its CRAGHOPPERS brand". They are: UK trade mark number 146373 registered on 31 December 1980; EU trade mark number 158493 registered on 1 April 1996; and US trade mark number 2306431 registered on 21 July 1997. Each of those registered marks is evidenced by an extract from the relevant trade mark register.
- 5.9 The Complainant asserts that the First Domain Name is "designed by the Respondent to be misleadingly close to the Complainant's CRAGHOPPERS mark", because it adds an extra G to the Complainant's mark and omits the final S. It contends that this is "an intentional, deceptive typographical error".
- 5.10 Likewise, it contends that the second Domain Name differs from the Complainant's mark only by the addition of the prefix "www". Again, it asserts that this is a "typographical deception designed to capture traffic from web users" and relies in this regard on the decision in DRS 18441 (*wwwscottishpower.co.uk*).
- 5.11 As to Abusive Registration, the Complainant relies, firstly, on what it cites as paragraph 5.1.1.2 of the Policy (though this is presumably intended to refer to paragraph 5.1.2), contending that the Domain Names are highly likely to confuse people or businesses into believing that the Domain Names are registered to, operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with it, with particular reference to initial interest confusion, as referred to in paragraph 3.3 of the DRS Experts' Overview (the "Overview"). It suggests that it is "reasonable to infer from the nature of the Domain Names themselves that a substantial number of people will be confused into believing that, at least at first glance, the Domain Names are owned or controlled by the Complainant". It asserts, in support of this contention, that both Domain Names are "inherently confusing, in and of themselves", given that the Domain Names differs only very slightly from the Complainant's CRAGHOPPERS mark and that the Second Domain Name differs only by the addition of the prefix "www".

- 5.12 Secondly, the Complainant relies on paragraph 5.1.1.3 of the Policy, i.e. unfair disruption of its business, because the Domain Names "divert web users expecting to find content relating to the Complainant (by virtue of the inclusion of the Complainant's mark as the dominant element of the Domain Names) to a variety of third-party advertising, including that relating to the Complainant's competitors". The Complainant acknowledges that the sale of traffic is not of itself necessarily objectionable under the Policy (see paragraph 8.5), but relies on subparagraphs 8.5.1 to 8.5.3, which require the Expert to take into account in this regard: the nature of the domain name; the nature of any advertising links on any parking page associated with the domain name; and that the use of the domain name is ultimately the respondent's responsibility.
- 5.13 The Complainant contends that the Respondent's sale of traffic is objectionable because "the diversion of web users to monetised content they were not expecting to see is inherently disruptive to the Complainant, especially where any traffic to the website must have necessarily resulted from the confusion caused by the fact that both the Domain Names are similar to the Complainant's CRAGHOPPERS mark".
- 5.14 Thirdly, the Complainant relies on paragraph 5.3 of the Policy, contending that the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of registrations which correspond to well known names or trade marks in which the Respondent has no apparent rights, and the Domain Names are part of that pattern. It relies in this regard on the Respondent's registration of some 47,000 domain names in the .uk ccTLD, a number of which prima facie infringe third party rights.
- 5.15 It further relies on the fact that many of those domain names resolve to pay-per-click advertising in a manner similar to the Domain Names. It contends that that demonstrates that the Respondent habitually registered domain names closely related to third party marks and monetises the associated websites. The Domain Names are being used in that manner and therefore are part of that pattern.
- 5.16 Finally, the Complainant submits that there are none of the circumstances present as set out in section 8 of the Policy by which the Respondent would be able to demonstrate that the Domain Names are not Abusive Registrations. In particular, they are not being used in association with a genuine offering of goods or services (paragraph 8.1.1.1.); to the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has never been known by or legitimately connected with the terms WWWCRAGHOPPERS, CRAGGHOPPER or CRAGHOPPERS (paragraph 8.1.1.2); there is no evidence that the Domain Names are registered for legitimate, non-commercial or any fair use purposes (paragraph 8.1.1.3); and neither of the Domain Names is generic or descriptive, as evidenced by extracts from the Oxford English Dictionary which shows "no exact match found" for any of the three aforementioned terms.

Response

- 5.17 The Respondent asserts that it is a foreign company which owns a portfolio of "generic and descriptive domain names" which it acquired "through lawful and fair methods". It says that it has "a liberal transfer policy", i.e. it is generally willing voluntarily to transfer domain names when it is contacted by a third party rights holder asserting its rights. It says that it does so "irrespective of the legitimacy of the complainant's arguments, in an effort to avoid the needless time and expense associated with litigation and administrative hearings".
- 5.18 The Respondent contends that it was unaware of the Complainant and its marks and asserts that the Domain Names are similar to the dictionary word 'grasshopper' and were simply misspellings of that word.

- 5.19 It says that as soon as it became aware of the Complainant's complaint, it offered voluntary transfer of the Domain Names, but this was declined by the Complainant.
- 5.20 Unusually, the Respondent asks the Expert to order the transfer of the Domain Names to the Complainant "without findings of fact or conclusions other than the Domain Name [sic] be transferred". In support of that request, the Respondent cites numerous decisions under the UDRP, made both by WIPO and by the NAF, to the effect that, where a respondent agrees voluntarily to transfer a domain name, the UDRP Panel (i.e. the equivalent of an Independent Expert under the DRS) has no mandate to make findings of fact. The Respondent submits that "both judicial efficiency and judicial wisdom counsel the Panel to order the transfer without an evaluation of the merits".

Reply

- 5.21 The Complainant takes issue with the Respondent's request for an order for a transfer without consideration of the merits and states in terms that the Respondent's request is opposed by it.
- 5.22 It contends that that request is misconceived, first, because it is based on decisions under the UDRP, whereas the Overview makes it clear that UDRP decisions are "*rarely likely to be helpful*" in a DRS proceeding.
- 5.23 Further, it relies on paragraph 5.14 of the Overview which provides that: "*if, however, the Complainant insists on a decision and pays the prescribed fee, the papers will be sent to an Expert for a decision*". The Complainant contends that it is therefore entitled to a full reasoned decision.
- 5.24 In addition, the Complainant submits that to accede to the Respondent's request would enable the Respondent to evade the provisions of paragraph 5.3 of the Policy, i.e. the presumption of Abusive Registration where a respondent has been found to have made an Abusive Registration in three or more DRS cases in the preceding two years. It points out, in this regard, that such a request for no findings of fact has also been made by this Respondent in two other current DRS proceedings, namely DRS 19925 and DRS 19893.
- 5.25 As to the other elements of the Response, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has failed to counter any of the Complainant's submissions on Abusive Registration and to suggest that of the potentially exculpatory circumstances set out in paragraph 8 of the Policy might apply. It rejects the grasshopper explanation as "wholly lacking in credibility". It points out that "craghopper" and "grasshopper" are different in five out of the 11 characters, that there is no similarity in pronunciation or aurally, nor any conceptual similarity, and no similarity in appearance (other than in relation to the "hoppers" element).
- 5.26 It asserts that the Domain Names are typical examples of typo-squatting designed to capture mistyped URLs.

6 Discussions and Findings

Should there be a reasoned decision in this DRS proceeding?

- 6.1 Unusually in this case, it is common ground between the Complainant and the Respondent that the Domain Names be transferred to the Complainant. On the face of it, therefore, this DRS proceeding is otiose. That in turn raises the question of whether there is any need for the Expert to consider the evidence and to provide a reasoned decision.

- 6.2 The Respondent says there is not. Indeed, it goes further. It says, by reference to a number of decisions under the UDRP, that, in such circumstances, the Expert is not entitled to make a decision and that it would be "improper" and/or "unwise" to make any findings of fact.
- 6.3 The Complainant, however, insists that it is entitled to a reasoned decision in writing "which determines the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence in accordance with sections 18.4 and 24.3 of the Policy".
- 6.4 Paragraph 5.14 of the Overview provides the following guidance:
- "Occasionally, following the filing of the Complaint, but before the case papers have been passed to an Expert for decision, the Respondent informs the Complainant (and/or Nominet) that he is willing to transfer the domain name to the Complainant without charge. If the Complainant agrees to accept the domain name on that basis, there is a procedure whereby Nominet can process the transfer. If, however, the Complainant insists on a decision and pays the prescribed fee, the papers will be sent to an Expert for a decision."* (emphasis added).
- 6.5 In this case, plainly the Complainant has not agreed to accept transfer of the Domain Names on such a basis, and the papers have therefore been sent to an Expert for a decision. For that reason, the Complaint should be considered on its merits and a reasoned decision provided.
- 6.6 The clear wording of paragraph 5.14 of the Overview cannot, it seems to this Expert, be displaced by the UDRP authorities on which the Respondent seeks to rely. In the first place, the UDRP has no equivalent to paragraph 5.14 of the Overview. Further, the foreword to the Overview makes it plain that *"the citation of UDRP decisions in a dispute under the DRS Policy is rarely likely to be helpful"*.
- 6.7 The Complainant also submits that failure to provide a reasoned decision would, or might, enable the Respondent to evade the 'three strikes' provision under paragraph 5.3 of the Policy, whereby there is a presumption of Abusive Registration where a respondent *"has been found to have made an Abusive Registration"* (emphasis added) in three or more DRS cases in the two years before the complaint was filed. This submission has some force, particularly in light of the Complainant's assertion (if correct) that the Respondent has made the same request in two other live DRS cases as well. Such gaming of the DRS would plainly be undesirable and is unlikely to operate in the public interest.
- 6.8 For these reasons, this Decision has been provided, notwithstanding the Respondent's willingness to transfer the Domain Names to the Complainant.

General

- 6.9 To succeed under the DRS Policy, the Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities, first, that it has Rights (as defined in the Policy) in respect of a name or mark that is identical or similar to the Domain Name (paragraph 2.1.1 of the Policy), and secondly, that the Domain Name is an Abusive Registration in the hands of the Respondent (paragraph 2.1.2).
- 6.10 Abusive Registration is defined in paragraph 1 of the Policy in the following terms:

"Abusive Registration means a Domain Name which either:

(i) was registered or otherwise acquired in a manner which, at the time when the registration or acquisition took place, took unfair advantage of or was unfairly detrimental to the Complainant's Rights; or

(ii) is being or has been used in a manner which has taken unfair advantage of or has been unfairly detrimental to the Complainant's Rights."

Complainant's rights

- 6.11 Paragraph 2.1.1 of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that it "*has Rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the Domain Name*". "Rights" means "*rights enforceable by the Complainant, whether under English law or otherwise, and may include rights in descriptive terms which have acquired a secondary meaning*" (paragraph 1).
- 6.12 The Complainant plainly has the requisite Rights (as defined) by virtue of its registered UK, EU and US marks.
- 6.13 As to similarity, as the Complainant submits, it is now also well settled under the Policy that the *.co.uk* suffix can be ignored for these purposes.
- 6.14 As to the relevant part of the Domain Names, both are similar to the CRAGHOPPERS mark. CRAGGHOPPER repeats one letter (with no phonetic difference) and omits another, a classic example of 'typosquatting'. WWWCRAGHOPPERS has simply added the "www" prefix to the Complainant's mark in exactly the same manner as in DRS 18441 (*wwwscottishpower.co.uk*).
- 6.15 Paragraph 2.3 of the Overview states that: "*Mis-spelled versions of names are normally found to be similar to their originals. Additional elements rarely trouble experts.*"
- 6.16 Accordingly, the Complainant has demonstrated the requisite degree of similarity between the CRAGHOPPERS mark and each of the Domain Names, and has therefore succeeded in proving that it has Rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to each of the Domain Names.

Abusive Registration

- 6.17 The Complainant submits that this is a case of Abusive Registration on three separate grounds:
- 6.17.1 confusion or likelihood thereof (Policy 5.1.2);
 - 6.17.2 unfair disruption of its business (Policy 5.1.1.3); and
 - 6.17.3 pattern of infringing registrations (Policy 5.1.3).
- 6.18 Paragraph 5.1.2 of the Policy includes, as a factor which may be evidence that a domain name is an Abusive Registration, circumstances indicating that the Respondent is using or threatening to use the domain name in a way which is confusing or is likely to confuse people or businesses into believing that the domain name is registered to, operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with the Complainant.
- 6.19 The references in the Complaint to paragraph 5.1.1.2 of the Policy (which in fact relates to blocking registrations) is presumably, having regard to the Complainant's submissions as summarised at paragraph 5.11 above, intended to refer to paragraph 5.1.2 of the Policy. This decision therefore proceeds on that footing.
- 6.20 The Complainant asserts in this regard that it is reasonable to infer "from the nature of the Domain Names themselves" that a substantial number of people will be confused into believing that, at least at first glance, the Domain Names are owned or controlled by the Complainant.

No evidence has been provided in support of that assertion. It appears that the Expert is invited to make that inference essentially on the basis of the Domain Names themselves.

- 6.21 The Complainant relies on paragraph 3.3 of the Overview which provides, as relevant, the following guidance:

"In such cases, the speculative visitor to the registrant's web site will be visiting it in the hope and expectation that the web site is a web site "operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with the Complainant." This is what is known as 'initial interest confusion' and the overwhelming majority of Experts view it as a possible basis for a finding of Abusive Registration, the vice being that even if it is immediately apparent to the visitor to the web site that the site is not in any way connected with the Complainant, the visitor has been deceived. Having drawn the visitor to the site, the visitor may well be faced with an unauthorised tribute or criticism site (usually the latter) devoted to the Complainant; or a commercial web site, which may or may not advertise goods or services similar to those produced by the Complainant. Either way, the visitor will have been sucked in/deceived by the domain name. In the High Court decision Och-Ziff Management Europe Ltd v Och Capital LLP [2010] EWHC 2599 (Ch), the court quoted the International Trade Mark Association definition of initial interest confusion as being "a doctrine which has been developing in US trademarks cases since the 1970s, which allows for a finding of liability where a plaintiff can demonstrate that a consumer was confused by a defendant's conduct at the time of interest in a product or service, even if that initial confusion is corrected by the time of purchase". In that case the court held that initial interest confusion is legally actionable under European trade mark legislation.

In DRS 07991 (toshiba-laptop-battery.co.uk) an aspect which the appeal panel regarded as being indicative of abusive use was the fact that the Respondent was using the domain name featuring the Complainant's trade mark to sell in addition to the Complainant's goods, goods competing with the Complainant's goods.

Findings of Abusive Registration in this context are most likely to be made where the domain name in issue is identical to the name or mark of the Complainant and without any adornment (other than the generic domain suffix). See for example DRS 00658 (chivasbrothers.co.uk).

The further away the domain name is from the Complainant's name or mark, the less likely a finding of Abusive Registration. However, the activities of typosquatters are generally condemned - see for example DRS 03806 (privalege.co.uk) - as are those people who attach as appendages to the Complainant's name or mark a word appropriate to the Complainant's field of activity. See for example the Appeal decisions in DRS 00248 (seiko-shop.co.uk) and DRS 07991 (toshiba-laptop-battery.co.uk).

Subsequent to the Och-Ziff case (supra) the Court of Appeal in Interflora v Marks and Spencer [2014] EWCA Civ 1403 criticised the use of "initial interest confusion" as a concept relevant to English trade mark law. This case was discussed by the Appeal Panel in DRS 15788 (starwars.co.uk) who concluded that initial interest confusion remained an applicable principle in determining whether or not a domain name registration was abusive."

- 6.22 In this case, neither of the Domain Names is identical to the CRAGHOPPERS mark. The question is therefore whether the Domain Names are far enough away from the Complainant's mark to avoid a finding of Abusive Registration on the basis of a likelihood of initial interest confusion.

- 6.23 In this Expert's judgment, they are not. The First Domain Name is pretty much on all fours with *privalege.co.uk*, the difference being that a single letter has been added rather than substituted, and an additional letter omitted. Likewise, the Second Domain Name is identical to the mark, save for the addition of the 'www' prefix.
- 6.24 The Complainant has therefore succeeded in demonstrating, for the purposes of paragraph 5.1.2 of the Policy, at the very least a likelihood of confusion.
- 6.25 The Complainant also relies on paragraph 5.1.1.3 of the Policy, which includes as a factor which may be evidence that a Domain Name is an Abusive Registration circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or otherwise acquired the Domain Names primarily for the purpose of unfairly disrupting the business of the Complainant.
- 6.26 The Complainant relies in this regard on the Respondent's use of pay-per-click advertising on the websites to which the Domain Names point and the fact that the further webpages to which those websites link include those of competitors of the Complainant.
- 6.27 As the Overview points out, all the circumstances set out in paragraph 5.1.1, including paragraph 5.1.1.3, concern the motives of the registrant at the time of registration of the domain name. No evidence is provided of the Respondent's motives at the time of registration of the Domain Names, whether direct or circumstantial. It may, for example, be the case that the Respondent registered the Domain Names primarily for the purpose of monetising the pay-per-click advertising potential of such typo-squatting. Whether or not that caused any disruption to the Complainant's business may have been a secondary motive, or of no concern at all to the Respondent.
- 6.28 Further, paragraph 8.5 of the Policy (see 5.12 and 5.13 above) does not assist it in this context. Paragraph 8.5 is one of the list of factors which may be evidence that a domain name does not constitute Abusive Registration. Sub-paragraphs 8.5.1 to 8.5.3, on which the Complainant seeks to rely, are in effect qualifications to the defence under 8.5. It is not therefore easy to see how they would be engaged when considering whether a Complainant has made its case under paragraph 5.1.1.3.
- 6.29 Accordingly, notwithstanding that the Expert accepts that both Domain Names are (probably intentionally) deceptive typographical variants of the Complainant's mark, and that at least some of the advertising links are to genuine websites operated by competitors of the Complainant, the Complainant has failed to discharge its burden of proof in relation to paragraph 5.1.1.3 of the Policy.
- 6.30 Finally, the Complainant relies on paragraph 5.1.3 of the Policy, which includes as a factor which may be evidence of Abusive Registration, evidence that the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of registrations where the Respondent is the registrant of domain names which correspond to well known names or trade marks in which the Respondent has no apparent rights, and – importantly – the domain name in question is part of that pattern.
- 6.31 The Complainant has adduced compelling evidence not only of the quantity of the Respondent's registration of domain names (approximately 47,000 in the *.uk* ccTLD), but also of the fact that many of them appear to infringe third party rights in the manner contemplated in paragraph 5.1.3 of the Policy.
- 6.32 The Complainant has extracted and exhibited approximately 37,000 *.uk* domain names registered by the Respondent. Some of those are generic and/or descriptive. However, many appear on the face of it to infringe third party rights, in some cases because they constitute what appears to be a name or mark in which a third party has rights (e.g. *archerfieldgolfclub.co.uk*,

royalhotelthurso.co.uk), but more often because they are deliberate mis-spellings of the third party name or mark (e.g. *bririshgas.co.uk*, *mercedes-bens.co.uk*, *robertdyass.co.uk*) or because they include a third party name or mark with a prefix or suffix (e.g. *asdahome.co.uk*, *wwweuropcar.co.uk*, *wwwvodaphone.co.uk*).

- 6.33 Trading in domain names for profit and/or holding a large portfolio of domain names, is not, of itself, objectionable under the DRS or at law (Policy, paragraph 8.4). However, in this case, it is plain from the evidence provided by the Complainant that the Respondent is engaged in large scale registration of domain names which appear to infringe the rights of third parties, as specified at 6.32. Moreover, the Domain Names are in the latter two categories set out above, and therefore are part of that pattern of infringing domain names. The Respondent therefore falls foul of paragraph 5.1.3 of the Policy.
- 6.34 No credible counter or explanation is advanced by the Respondent in relation to any of the Complainant's arguments on Abusive Registration, nor does it seek to rely on any of the potentially exculpatory factors set out in section 8 of the Policy. Indeed, "without admitting fault or liability", it expressly declines to respond "substantively to the allegations raised by the Complainant herein". The Respondent's position is that it does not contest the Complainant's request for transfer to it of the Domain Names, but does not want any findings to be made on Abusive Registration.
- 6.35 The Complainant has therefore, on the balance of probabilities, demonstrated Abusive Registration on the grounds set out in paragraphs 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 of the Policy and accordingly has proven Abusive Registration pursuant to paragraph 2.1.2 of the Policy.

7 Decision

- 7.1 The Expert finds that the Complainant has Rights in a name or mark which is identical or similar to the Domain Names and that the Domain Names are, in the hands of the Respondent, Abusive Registrations.
- 7.2 It is therefore determined that, as both the Complainant and the Respondent request, the Domain Names be transferred to the Complainant.

David Engel

Signed

Dated 17 April 2018