
IGO Complainant (as defined in draft Rec #1) files URS complaint electronically. Per draft Rec #4, the IGO Complainant will not be required to submit to Mutual Jurisdiction, but must agree to binding arbitration to resolve a challenge to the panel determination if respondent agrees.
Domain name locked
Proceeding formally initiated: forward copy of Complaint to Respondent (with response due in 14 calendar days)
Single examiner appointed
Panel carries out review, taking into account draft Rec 1.
Examiner finds in favor of the Complainant, domain name is immediately suspended.
Per draft rec #4, Registrant informed of availability to file appeal and/or participate in binding arbitration.
If the registrant elects to appeal, it would precede the options below
If the court instead decides the case on its merits, decision carried out accordingly
Losing registrant initiates court proceedings or selects arbitration or or does not respond?
Arbitration
Court
Per draft Rec #4, parties mutually agree to binding arbitration.
Court unble to proceed
Option being considered in draft Rec #4 to allow arbitration where the court does NOT decide the case on its merits.
No response
Suspension of domain name maintained
Per draft Rec #5, arbitration conducted in accordance with law as mutually agreed; if unable to agree, then IGO complainant's choice of registrar or respondent law.
Decision carried out accordingly