

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Major League Baseball Properties, Inc. v. Nguyen Tien Anh  
Case No. D2025-4893

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Major League Baseball Properties, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by BMVN International LLC, Viet Nam.

The Respondent is Nguyen Tien Anh, Viet Nam.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <vn-mlb.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 25, 2025. On November 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 27, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 27, 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 November 28, 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 December 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Douglas Clark as the sole panelist in this matter on January 26, 2026. 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**

Major League Baseball (MLB) is a professional baseball organization operating in the United States and Canada. Its origins date back to 1876. MLB currently comprises 30 member clubs / professional baseball teams. The Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of Major League Baseball Enterprises, Inc. which is the commercial arm of the MLB brand. The Complainant is the sole agent for the license to use the names, logos, trademarks, service marks, and trade dress, together with all intellectual property belonging to ownership or control of the teams, the Commissioner's Office, and the Complainant itself over retail products in MLB. The Complainant also acts as an agent for clubs in trademark protection, quality control, design services, accounting and auditing. The MLB brand officially entered the Vietnamese market in 2019 with the opening of its first store, distributed by Maison Retail Management International Joint Stock Company ("Maison").

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks including the following trademarks including in Viet Nam where the Respondent is apparently located:

- MLB – United States trademark registration no. 2847893, registered on June 1, 2004, covering Class 14; and
- MLB – Viet Nam trademark registration no. 4-0368939-000, registered on November 5, 2020, covering Classes 18, 25, and 35.

The Complainant also has a number of domain names that contain the MLB trademark, including <mlb.com>, created on November 1, 1994.

The Respondent is Nguyen Tien Anh, an individual apparently residing in Viet Nam. The website under the disputed domain name resolves to a site prominently featuring MLB at the top and primarily offering what appears to be New York Yankees clothing, bags and headgear. The New York Yankees are a member of the MLB. <sup>1</sup>

#### **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 (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's website intends to pose off as the Complainant's official store by asserting that the website belongs to Maison, which is the sole authorized distributor of MLB-branded products in Viet Nam.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has visited some public available websites. The Panel considers this process of verification useful in assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.8.

## **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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "vn" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation/passing off 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 7, 2025, and has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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 impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. 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 <vn-mlb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Douglas Clark/*

**Douglas Clark**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 11, 2026