Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

| Domain | Name |
|--------|------|
|--------|------|

personsname.tld

| Request category | Private individual | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Was the provided category | Yes | |
| correct? | No No | |
| Data requested | All | |
| Data requested | Partial | |

Purpose for request

The requestor selected "Law Enforcement" as the request category, and asked for both expedited processing and confidentiality.

They allege that the site owner is publishing the requestor's personal information and private photos. The requestor is asking for registration data to *potentially* provide to law enforcement, but also claims there is an active investigation.

| | Disclosure decision Partially approv Data is public Denied | 'ed |
|--|--|-----|
|--|--|-----|

Disclosure decision reasoning

The request does not truly appear to be submitted by a member of law enforcement, as it was provided on behalf of a private individual and was sent in from a Gmail address. There was no supporting information warranting expedited processing or confidentiality.

We found no legitimate interest as there is no evidence that there is an actual legal case.

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

princessname.tld

| Request category | Security |
|---------------------------|----------|
| Was the provided category | Ves |
| correct? | No No |
| Data requested | All |
| Data requested | Partial |

Purpose for request

Domain Name

The requestor indicated that they were writing an article on cybersecurity in relation to marginalized sexual communities, focused on why members of those communities may have heightened privacy needs and on how a threat actor could use tools including the RDRS to access or expose personal data.

| | Disclosure decision | Approved Partially approve Data is public Denied | d |
|--|---------------------|---|---|
|--|---------------------|---|---|

Disclosure decision reasoning

This domain uses our Privacy service, so any available data is already public. Because the requestor appeared to want to contact the registrant, if the data had not already been public we would have provided instructions about how to use the public RDDS to contact the registrant directly, noting that the registrant would be under no obligation to respond.

It felt like a very backwards request since it was asking for information about a marginalized population to prove that information about marginalized populations may be too easy to get, thus further marginalizing them.

Other info

Requestors frequently ask for **full** Whois data simply because they want to contact the registrant—but they already **can** contact the registrant. The registrant is under no more obligation to respond to them if their information has been disclosed, whether for participation in an article about privacy or to respond to an unsolicited offer to purchase their domain.

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

Domain Name

trademarkCC.tld

| Request category | Intellectual Property lawyer | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| Was the provided category | Yes | | |
| correct? | ✓ No | | |
| Data requested | All | | |
| Data requested | Partial | | |

Purpose for request

Domain was a trademark followed by a two-letter country-code, implying that this was the that-country's website for the brand.

Request came from a law firm specializing in brand protection, provided the name of the attorney working on the matter, including proof of representation and authority, outlined the mark (which was identical in the domain), and indicated that they wanted the information so that they could begin legal proceedings.

| | \checkmark | Approved |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Diselecture desision | | Partially approved |
| Disclosure decision | | Data is public |
| | | Denied |

Disclosure decision reasoning

The request clearly outlined the reason that the data was requested: to begin legal proceedings. The infringement was clear in the domain name and clearly related to the requestor's client's mark.

Other info

The requestor classified themselves as "Research (non-security)", which doesn't make sense since they are clearly an intellectual property firm and the person who filed the request was an attorney at that firm. It is not clear why they didn't select "IP holder"— perhaps because they only represent the IP holder...?

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

| Domain Name | trademark-language.tld(s) |
|-------------|---------------------------|
|-------------|---------------------------|

| Request category | Intellectual Property lawyer | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Was the provided category | Yes | |
| correct? | V No | |
| Data regulacted | All | |
| Data requested | Partial | |

Purpose for request

In-house brand-protection counsel from markholder (as validated by their email address) requested information for multiple domains that (a) included the brand exactly and (b) included other information that implied a relationship, including "help" or business-line-related words.



Disclosure decision reasoning

Requestor demonstrated a need to identify the registrant in each case for which access was granted.

Note that there were some domains for which information was already publicly available (Whois Privacy) and others that had already expired, which were denied for those reasons.

Other info

Requestor used "Consumer protection" rather than "IP holder" to identify themselves.

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

businessnameinc.tld

| Request category | Registrant company | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Was the provided category | Yes | |
| correct? | V No | |
| Data requested | All | |
| Data requested | Partial | |

Purpose for request

Domain Name

The requestor claimed to have recently purchased the business which owns the domain, and requested an update to the registration data.

| | | Approved Partially approved |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Disclosure decision | = | Data is public |
| | | Denied |

Disclosure decision reasoning

The registration data is already public (not Privacy or Proxy, but the registrant's data); the requestor is not using the RDRS for its intended purpose. If the registrant wants to update their data they should follow the appropriate process (which is not via RDRS)

| Other info | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | | |

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

| _ | | | |
|------|-----|------|--|
| Dom | ain | Name | |
| υυιι | am | name | |

IPinfringer.tld

| Request category | Intellectual Property lawyer | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Was the provided category correct? | Yes No | |
| Data requested | All Partial | |

Purpose for request

The requestor represented a business which is the owner of registered EU and UK trademarks. The website at the requested domain was considered by the requestor to infringe on their client's intellectual property rights.

The client issued a legal claim against the last known registrant, who asserted that they are no longer the registrant of the domain and could not indicate who the new registrant is. The requestor wanted current registration data and any further information the registrar may have about the domain.

| | Approved |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| Disclosure decision | Partially approved |
| Disclosure decision | Data is public |
| | Denied |

Disclosure decision reasoning

The request was denied due to limited information and specificity provided, and the ability to instead use other mechanisms to address the concern (violation of Intellectual Property rights).

The Registrar provided instructions for how to contact the domain owner directly via the publicly-available RDDS, and suggestions on next steps for IP infringement or reporting illegal activity to law enforcement.

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

Domain Name notlawenforcement.tld

| Request category | Third party |
|---------------------------|-------------|
| Was the provided category | Yes |
| correct? | No No |
| Data requested | All |
| Data requested | Partial |

Purpose for request

The requestor asserted that the domain name was active, that there were "signs of violation", and that unnamed authorities needed domain name registration data for further processing.

| Disclosure decision | | Approved Partially approved Data is public Denied |
|---------------------|--|--|
|---------------------|--|--|

Disclosure decision reasoning

The request was submitted under the "Law Enforcement" category but was not submitted by a law enforcement agent. The request was denied due to both falsifying the requestor category and not providing sufficient information

Other info

This registrar also does not accept *any* LEA requests through RDRS (they have a special platform for LEA to use instead), so if the request *had* been valid they would still have directed the requestor to a different process.

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

| Domain Name | SecurityTestingProvider.tld |
|-------------|-----------------------------|
| | |

| Request category | Security Researcher |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Was the provided category | Yes |
| correct? | No No |
| Data regulacted | All |
| Data requested | Partial |

Purpose for request

No reason was provided. The requestor checked the box to indicate that an LEA request (subpoena, warrant, etc) had been issued, but the attached documents were spam.

| Disclosure decision Partial Data is Denied |
|--|
|--|

Disclosure decision reasoning

The request was denied because the requestor used the RDRS system to deliver spam instead of making a valid request. The requestor checked the law enforcement due process box, but failed to attach relevant documentation. The requestor failed to provide any justification for the request.

Other info

All valid RDRS requests we have received to date have been for data that is publicly available (e.g. proxy data)

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

| Domain Name | securitytestdomain.tld |
|-------------|------------------------|
| | |

| Request category | IP Holder |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| Was the provided category | Ves |
| correct? | No No |
| Data requested | ✓ All |
| Data requested | Partial |

Purpose for request

The requestor represented the IP Holder which had used the "brand name" as a part of their company name for over 100 years. They provided proof of the UK trademark covering retail and business. There were MX records associated with the domain and the requestor was concerned that it would be used for fraudulent purposes.

| Defiled | Disclosure decision Partially approved Data is public Denied | Disclosure decision | |
|---------|---|---------------------|--|
|---------|---|---------------------|--|

Disclosure decision reasoning

The registrant uses a Whois Privacy Protection service. We're unable to release the underlying data without a legally binding court order or subpoena authorizing us to do so.

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

Partial

| Domain Name | Searchengine.tld |
|---------------------------|--------------------|
| | |
| Request category | Research non-secur |
| Was the provided category | Yes |
| correct? | No No |
| Data requested | All |
| ναια ι εγμεδιεύ | |

Purpose for request

To "reach out" to the owner. Nothing more, nothing less.

| Disclosure decision | _ | Approved Partially approved Data is public Denied |
|---------------------|---|--|
|---------------------|---|--|

Disclosure decision reasoning

The request is incomplete. The requestor provided no information besides an email address. They made the request under a "research" category, but provided absolutely no reason or explanation other than "to reach out" -- no explanation, no context, nothing.

If the requestor had provided their contact information, their reason for the request, and what they want the information for (e.g. "reach out to assist with a research project" or "reach out to assist with an investigation or inquiries" or even "reach out to assist with a domain IP dispute") these could have been greatly beneficial but as it stands, there's no name, no explanation, no context, and so no ability to disclose.

Other info

While we provide a publicly-accessible contact method for all domains, in some circumstances we would also disclose registration data for contact purposes (e.g. for LEA)

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

| Domain Name | UDRPrelateddomain.tld |
|-------------|-----------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------|

| Request category | Dispute Resolution (non-IP) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Was the provided category | Yes |
| correct? | ✓ No |
| Data requested | All |
| Data requested | Partial |

Purpose for request

The requestor erroneously identified themselves as LEA when instead they provide services related to Domain Name Dispute Resolution. Their request was in relation to a domain dispute and possible trademark infringement. The requestor cited an identical domain UDRP case and clearly was not law enforcement (which they self-identified as) however all of the evidence and reasoning and rationale made sense and was correct.

| Disclosure decision | \checkmark | Approved |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| | | Partially approved |
| | | Data is public |
| | | Denied |

Disclosure decision reasoning

We conducted a balancing test and assessed the reason and the evidence supplied and documentation supplied. Even though the applicant incorrectly identified themselves as LEA, we concluded that the request was valid and legitimate and we could not see any reason to not supply the requested information.

| Other info | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| | | | |

Examples have been anonymized and are intended to be solely illustrative

| Domain Name | Searchenginedomain.tld |
|-------------|------------------------|
|-------------|------------------------|

| Request category | Research (non-security) | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Was the provided category | Yes | |
| correct? | V No | |
| Data requested | ✓ All | |
| | Partial | |

Purpose for request

The requestor used RDRS but actually had a DNS Abuse complaint relating to the conduct of the website. The request included claims that the website owner was "hacking into my computer", and that the requestor had run scans and was montioring the site owner's network and searching abuse databases.

| Disclosure decision | Approved |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Partially approved |
| | Data is public |
| | Denied |

Disclosure decision reasoning

This description is more related to DNS Abuse than registrant data, and disclosure did not seem useful or appropriate.

The registrant data requested by the requestor is already listed publicly so there was no further action required.