

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VS Media, Inc. v. Juan Chavarria, VGMedia
Case No. D2023-2124

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VS Media, Inc., United States of America, represented internally.

The Respondent is Juan Chavarria, VGMedia, Colombia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <flirt4all.net> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Hostinger, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 12, 2023. On May 15, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 15, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy Protect, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 17, 2023, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 17, 2023, and an amendment to the Complaint on June 10, 2023.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 13, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 3, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 4, 2023.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on July 6, 2023. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant operates a commercial website, at “www.flirt4free.com”, which offers extensive adult content. The Complainant holds a registered trademark with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) for FLIRT4FREE, registered on February 4, 2003, under USPTO Reg. No. 2,684,274 in connection with such services. The USPTO registration indicates that the Complainant first used FLIRT4FREE as a mark in commerce on February 10, 1999. This trademark is referred to as the “FLIRT4FREE trademark” in this decision.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 12, 2022. The Disputed Domain Name currently does not resolve to an active website. The Complaint puts forward that for some period of time, however, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website (the “Respondent’s Website”) which offered adult content similar to that offered by the Complainant. At least some of that content was apparently taken without permission from the Complainant’s own website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary Matters

The Panel notes that no communication has been received from the Respondent. However, given the Complaint and Written Notice were sent to the relevant addresses disclosed by the Registrar, then the Panel considers that this satisfies the requirement in paragraph 2(a) of the UDRP Rules to “employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice”. Accordingly, the Panel considers it is able to proceed to determine this Complaint and to draw inferences from the Respondent’s failure to file any Response. While the Respondent’s failure to file a Response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent’s default (see, e.g., *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1909](#)).

Substantive Matters

To succeed, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical with or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name;
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has rights in the FLIRT4FREE trademark. The Panel finds the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to this trademark. Previous UDRP panels have consistently held that domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark for purposes of the Policy “when the domain name includes

the trademark, or a confusingly similar approximation, regardless of the other terms in the domain name” (*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#)). It is established that, where a mark is the distinctive part of a disputed domain name, the disputed domain name is considered to be confusingly similar to the registered mark (*DHL Operations B. V. v. DHL Packers*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1694](#)). In the present case the substitution of “all” for “free” results in what the Panel considers to be a confusingly similar approximation of the Complainant’s FLIRT4FREE trademark.

It is also well established that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), in this case “.net”, does not affect the Disputed Domain Name for the purpose of determining whether it is identical or confusingly similar. See, for example, *Rollerblade, Inc. v. Chris McCrady*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0429](#).

Accordingly the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and hence the first condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

- (i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

None of these apply in the present circumstances. The Complainant has not authorised, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or to use the FLIRT4FREE trademark. The Complainant has prior rights in the FLIRT4FREE trademark which precede the Respondent’s acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has therefore established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and thereby the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to produce evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name (see, for example, *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0624](#); *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#)).

The Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to produce any evidence to establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Panel finds the Respondent has no rights or any legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In the present circumstances the evidence as to the extent of the reputation the Complainant enjoys in the FLIRT4FREE trademark, and the fact that the Disputed Domain Name was linked to the Respondent’s Website which contained content taken from the Complainant’s own website (resulting apparently in several DMCA notices being sent by the Complainant) lead the Panel to conclude the registration and use were in bad faith.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent chose to register a name comprising a confusingly similar approximation to the Complainant’s trademark in order to facilitate a scheme where the Respondent’s website would attract customers because they believed the Respondent’s Website was that of the Complainant.

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy a non-exhaustive list of factors evidencing registration and use in bad faith comprises:

- (i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

In the present circumstances the Panel concludes that factor (iv) applies as the Respondent was seeking to achieve commercial gain by using a domain name which was confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark to attract Internet users to the Respondent's Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website. The Panel also notes that the Respondent has not filed a Response and hence has not availed itself of the opportunity to present any case of good faith that it might have. The Panel infers that none exists.

The Disputed Domain Name currently does not resolve to an active website. It is generally recognised that the passive holding of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith (See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)", section 3.3"); this is all the more so given the approximation of the Complainant's mark into a confusingly similar domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name <flirt4all.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nick J. Gardner/

Nick J. Gardner

Sole Panelist

Date: July 20, 2023