

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc v. Name Redacted, Gateway Outsourcing Inc
Case No. D2025-5450

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, United Kingdom, represented by Kilburn & Strode, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Name Redacted, Gateway Outsourcing Inc,¹ United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <acquisition-bloomsbury.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 December 31, 2025. On January 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 4, 2026, 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 January 5, 2026, 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 January 8, 2026.

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

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the personal name of a third party without authorization when registering the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 January 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2026. On January 30, February 3, 5, 6 and 20, 2026, a third party sent several email communications to the Center. The Center received an email from another third party on February 7, 2026. The Center sent an email regarding possible settlement to the Parties on February 9, 2026, and the Complainant did not request a suspension for settlement discussions. Therefore, the Center commenced its panel appointment process on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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

The Complainant is a global publishing house established in 1986 which has published numerous well-known and top selling books, including the Harry Potter series of books. The Complainant has offices in numerous jurisdictions and maintains an online retail business through its website at “www.bloomsbury.com”.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for BLOOMSBURY in various jurisdictions, including United States Trademark Registration No. 3779055 BLOOMSBURY in classes 9, and 16, having a registration date of April 20, 2010, and use in commerce dates of 2008 for class 9 goods, and 2004 for class 16 goods.

The Complainant’s mark BLOOMSBURY has been recognized as being well known by prior panels under the Policy. See, for example, *Bloomsbury Publishing Plc v. Nelson*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0851](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on October 6, 2025, and resolves to a website entitled “acquisition-bloomsbury.com - Launching Soon”, including a contact form.

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 as follows.

The disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith because it deliberately combines the Complainant’s well-known BLOOMSBURY mark with the descriptive term “acquisition”, which relates directly to the Complainant’s publishing business. There is no plausible good faith use of the disputed domain name as such. It argues further that the Respondent must have been aware of its reputation and selected the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant, particularly given a prior scam involving a highly similar domain name.

B. Respondent

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

The Center received multiple emails from third party senders offering to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The first purportedly received the Written Notice and claimed that it had previously

employed an outsourcing company Gateway Outsourcing Inc that had acted without its authorization to register the disputed domain name. The second, claiming to be Gateway Outsourcing Inc, merely indicated that it would not submit a formal Response and stipulated to transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

However, none of these emails were sent from the Registrar-verified email address for the Respondent. Despite the Center querying the relationship between these third parties and the Respondent, no evidence of any relevant relationship has been provided, and no correspondence has been received from the Registrar-verified email address for the Respondent.

The Panel is therefore not in a position to verify the exact relationship or authority over the disputed domain name of these third-parties, and the Panel thus will proceed to a decision on the merits.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's BLOOMSBURY 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 3.1](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms, here "acquisition-", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

For the reasons discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is likely that the disputed domain name has been registered for phishing or other malicious purposes. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's mark, falling within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant's evidence establishes that its mark was well known long prior to registration of the disputed domain name. UDRP panels have consistently found that registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a famous or well-known trademark, as in this case, by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Complainant claims to have previously been the subject of a scam whereby fraudulent emails were sent to potential customers claiming to be from the Complainant. The domain name used for the previous scam was <bloomsbury-acquisition.co.uk>. The Complainant succeeded in a complaint lodged against that domain name under the Dispute Resolution Service ("DRS") applicable to ".co.uk" domain names. See *Bloomsbury Publishing Plc v. Brooke Murphy*, Nominet DRS Case No. D00026626. Given the obvious similarity between the disputed domain name and that earlier scam domain name, the Complainant suggests that the disputed domain name may also be used for a similar scam.

The Complainant additionally presented evidence that a legitimate business trading as "Lighthouse Literary" ("www.lighthouseliterary.com") states as follows on its website:

"There is currently a scammer emailing and calling authors using an email address and caller ID with Lighthouse Literary in it and impersonating an agent. We are not affiliated with this scammer in any way. Please do your research before responding to any offers of representation. NEVER send money to a literary agent. A reputable agent will never ask for money."

The Respondent's Registrar-verified email address uses the domain name <lighthouseliterary.us>, and the Complainant's evidence establishes that this domain name previously resolved to the website for a purported publishing company. This, the Complainant suggests, is potentially further evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

The Panel has independently established² that at least one security vendor has in fact flagged the disputed domain name for phishing, which is a clear indicator of bad faith. *The Commissioners for HM Revenue and Customs v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Hoshyar Marshall*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0344](#). Combined with the Complainant's circumstantial evidence regarding phishing set out above, this points to the disputed domain name having been used for phishing, which is evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

² In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

The Panel's Internet searches for the second-level portion of the disputed domain name, "acquisition-bloomsbury", returned results overwhelmingly relating to the Complainant, which, combined with the repute of the Complainant's mark, indicates that good faith use of the disputed domain name is unlikely if not inconceivable. This, too, points to bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Finally, the inclusion within the disputed domain name's composition of the term "acquisition" points to targeting of the Complainant given its relevance to the Complainant's business in the form of publishing acquisition services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

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 <acquisition-bloomsbury.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026