

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Map Your Show, LLC v. suresh killo, orhami  
Case No. D2025-3514

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Map Your Show, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Frost Brown Todd LLC, United States.

The Respondent is suresh killo, orhami, India.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 29, 2025. On September 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 2, 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 (Registration Private, Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 2, 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 September 5, 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 September 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on October 2, 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**

The Complainant is a company based in the United States and provides both downloadable and non-downloadable event management software for trade show organizers and exhibition hosts.

The Complainant is the owner of a United States wordmark MAP YOUR SHOW No. 5314674, registered on October 24, 2017, for products and services in class 9 and 42 (the “MAP YOUR SHOW Trademark”).

The Complainant is also the owner of the <mapyourshow.com> domain name since 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 30, 2024, and, at the date of the decision, is inactive.

#### **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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the MAP YOUR SHOW trademark as it incorporates the “map” and “show” elements of the trademark and a substitution of the term “your” with “ur”. The Complainant adds that the omission of letters within a word is typically recognized as a misspelling, or a “typosquat” in the case of domain name disputes. The Complainant also points out that the use of “ur” is widely recognized as an informal shorthand or abbreviation for “your” due to its phonetic similarity, having originated as an informal shortcut to promote speed by shortening the number of characters used within words for textspeak and other forms of digital communication.

Then, the Complainant submits the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for illegitimate purposes which do not equate to a bona fide offering of services in connection with the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts some of its customers received a query regarding the solicitation of tradeshow event attendee pre-registration information. The email address associated with the sender of the fraudulent email used the disputed domain name. The Complainant adds the Respondent is neither a franchisee nor otherwise affiliated with the Complainant. Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is passively holding the disputed domain name and is preventing the Complainant from obtaining its rightful ownership and control of the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith by the Respondent. First, the Complainant states that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to capitalize on the goodwill associated with the MAP YOUR SHOW Trademark. The Complainant underlines that the Respondent has set up MX records for the disputed domain name, to send fraudulent email communications and to impersonate the Complainant. The Complainant considers that the disputed domain name was set up to engage in some type of business scam. The Complainant also points out that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the MAP YOUR SHOW Trademark.

## **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 trademark 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 trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

Indeed, a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. In this case, the disputed domain name includes the MAP YOUR SHOW Trademark, with the deletion of the letters "yo". The Panel finds that this misspelling of the Complainant's trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity notably since "ur" can be considered as an abbreviation of the term "your".

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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 recognized 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.

Indeed, it appears that the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way.

Moreover, it appears from the non-use of the disputed domain name, which resolves to a blank page, that the Respondent is not using or has not prepared to use the disputed domain name with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation and passing off as the Complainant and potential business scam, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name 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 are in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation and passing off as the Complainant and potential business scam, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <mapurshow.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/

**Christiane Féral-Schuhl**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 16, 2025