

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SeatGeek v. Jamie Langston, Jamie James Motor Company
Case No. D2023-4004

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SeatGeek, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Soteria LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Jamie Langston, Jamie James Motor Company, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aiseatgeek.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 25, 2023. On September 26, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 26, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 27, 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 September 27, 2023.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 September 29, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 23, 2023.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on November 7, 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 provides software and online services to help people buy tickets to sporting events, concerts and other events. It owns the mark SEATGEEK, for which it enjoys the benefit of registration in the United States (U.S. Reg. No. 4,062,477, registered on November 29, 2011).

According to the Whois information, the disputed domain name was registered on August 17, 2023. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name could be exploited to mount phishing attacks or launch scam campaigns against the Complainant's employees, clients and service providers, noting also that the Complainant's services include the use of artificial intelligence within its mobile platform.

As of the date of this decision, the disputed domain name did not forward to an active web page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical 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, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the SEATGEEK mark by providing evidence of relevant registration.

The disputed domain name incorporates the SEATGEEK mark in its entirety prefixed with the term "ai", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the

Complainant's SEATGEEK mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. The SEATGEEK mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a *prima facie* showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to use the SEATGEEK mark, (2) the Respondent has neither used the disputed domain name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services relating to the disputed domain name, nor provided any proof of preparations for such a *bona fide* offering of goods or services relating to the disputed domain name, and (3) there is no evidence that the identified Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required *prima facie* showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this *prima facie* showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent's favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Because the Complainant's SEATGEEK mark has been used in commerce for over a decade and is registered in the United States (the home country of the Respondent), the Panel finds it likely that the Respondent was aware of the SEATGEEK mark when it registered the disputed domain name. In the circumstances of this case, without the benefit of any explanation whatsoever from the Respondent, such a showing is sufficient to establish bad faith registration of the disputed domain name.

The circumstances also demonstrate bad faith use of the disputed domain name in terms of the Policy. Where a disputed domain name is connected with a well-known name and products, its very use by someone with no connection with the products suggests opportunistic bad faith. See, *Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#). Furthermore, from the inception of the UDRP, panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding (see section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <aiseatgeek.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: November 16, 2023