

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WorkNomads AD v. Hendra Hendra, P.T Asli Rancangan Indonesia
Case No. D2025-2957

1. The Parties

The Complainant is WorkNomads AD, Bulgaria, represented by Fencer BV, Belgium.

The Respondent is Hendra Hendra, P.T Asli Rancangan Indonesia, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <worknomads.net> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 24, 2025. On July 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 25, 2025, 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 (Unknown, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 30, 2025, 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 July 30, 2025.

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 July 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on August 27, 2025. 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

Since 2021, the Complainant has operated a global community for remote jobs, co-living, knowledge sharing and networking.

The Complainant owns European Union Trade Mark, No. 018544903 for WN WORKNOMADS, registered on December 16, 2021, in classes 35, 36, 38, 41, 43 and 45.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.worknomads.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 20, 2023.

As of July 9, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a website with a similar look and feel to the Complainant’s website featuring a “WN” logo that was very similar to that of the Complainant. The site was headed: “Discover the right freelance services to help your business thrive”. The footer stated: “Work Nomads is an online platform that connects businesses with top-notch freelance professionals from various industries...”

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that a dominant feature of the mark, namely the term “work nomads”, is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. While the disputed domain name consists of two common terms, the nature of the website at the disputed domain name, including a close copy of the Complainant’s logo, shows that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the purpose of illicitly targeting the Complainant. See further under the third element below.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation/passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. In particular, the Respondent uses a “WN” logo that is very similar to that of the Complainant, identifies itself as “Work Nomads” and purports to offer similar services to those of the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

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 <worknomads.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2025