

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jagex Limited v. Khaled Abdeljaber

Case No. DIO2025-0030

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jagex Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Khaled Abdeljaber, United States of America.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bitrune.io> (the “Domain Name”) 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 7, 2025. On August 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 8, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 15, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 August 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 has developed and published online video games and other electronic-based entertainment since year 2000. The Complainant offers two online role-playing games; RuneScape and Old School RuneScape. Together, the games average a total of more than 3 million active users per month since October 2022. Old School RuneScape has over 300 million accounts.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations, the most relevant to this Decision being RUNE trademarks, such as in the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office UK00911161239 (registered since October 9, 2013) and European Union European Union Intellectual Property Office 018622946 (registered since May 20, 2022). The Complainant owns domain names, for example <runescape.com> (registered in 2000). The Complainant is also active on social media and has received several awards for its games.

The Domain Name was registered on June 26, 2023. The Complainant provides evidence that the Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website that used the Complainant's copyright-protected content to offer a pirated version of the Complainant's game. At the time of drafting the Decision, the Domain Name resolved to an error page.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations that predate the registration of the Domain Name. The Complainant argues it has substantial goodwill and reputation in its trademarks, quoting former UDRP decisions filed by the Complainant. The Complainant argues that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to that of the Complainant's trademark as the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. The inclusion of the term "bit" increases the confusing similarity, as the term is descriptive when used in the context of online computer services/products.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent is not authorized to register or use a domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name, to offer a pirated version of the Complainant's game, does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not been known as "rune", and the Respondent is clearly not using the Domain Name for legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Based on the use of the Domian Name, the Complainant argues *inter alia* that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Complainant submits that the only plausible explanation is that the Respondent has tried to impersonate the Complainant to divert traffic from the Complainant's websites to the Respondent. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent disrupted the Complainant's business by diverting potential customers to its website which offered similar and competing goods and services. In the alternative, as the Domain Name does not currently resolve to an active webpage, the Complainant argues bad faith in accordance with the "passive holding", see section 3.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.<sup>1</sup>

The Complainant has established that it has rights in RUNE. The Domain Name incorporates the trademark with "bit" in front. This difference does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the Top-Level Domain; see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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. While the overall burden of proof in ioDRP 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 often-impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name is rather evidence of bad faith, see below.

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

### **C. Registered or 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), the Panel will refer to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) where relevant to this proceeding.

Based on the use and composition of the Domain Name, it is evident that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The said use of the Domain Name reflects the Respondent's intention to create confusion with the Complainant's trademark and serves as evidence of bad faith use under the paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent has used the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

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 Domain Name <bitrune.io> transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mathias Lilleengen/*

**Mathias Lilleengen**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2025