

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Travellers Exchange Corporation Limited v. dede dede
Case No. D2026-0010

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Travellers Exchange Corporation Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Addleshaw Goddard LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is dede dede, Singapore.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <travelexgball.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 2, 2026. On January 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 6, 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 (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 9, 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 12, 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 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 5, 2026.


The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on February 12, 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 leading foreign exchange and global travel money provider incorporated under the laws of England and Wales, United Kingdom; it was founded in 1976 (Annexes 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 to the Complaint).

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations containing the mark TRAVELEX, inter alia

- Australian trademark registration TRAVELEX (word), Reg. No. 663330, registered November 28, 1997;
- International trademark registration TRAVELEX (word), Reg. No. 1014563, registered July 30, 2009, designated for various jurisdictions around the world; and
- United States of America registration TRAVELEX (word), Reg. No. 1694803, registered June 16, 1992 (Annex 5 to the Complaint).

Moreover, the Complainant owns inter alia the figurative trademark registration for  (International registration No. 777721, registered on November 20, 2001) and uses this logo in business, inter alia on its websites available under various domain names containing the mark TRAVELEX (Annex 5 and 8 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered on November 14, 2025 (Annex 1 to the Complaint). At the time of filing the Complaint the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's logo  with slightly different color scheme and TRAVELEX trademarks, claiming to be the Complainant ("We are Travellex") and to be a CFD-Trader as well as prompting users to input login information and open an account (Annexes 10 - 13 to the Complaint).

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 they hold multiple registered trademarks for TRAVELEX. The Complainant also highlights the extensive use of the TRAVELEX mark since years, and that TRAVELEX is a distinctive identifier. The disputed domain name includes the entirety of the TRAVELEX mark differing only by the addition of the descriptive word "global" plus an additional "l" at the end, which is a common misspelling of the word "global". Where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a complainant's trademark, this will be sufficient to establish identical or confusing similarity.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name: The Respondent does not have any trademark rights to the term "travelxglobal" and there is also no evidence that the Respondent retains any trademark rights to such term or any term used in the disputed domain name or is commonly known by such term.

The Respondent has not received any license from the Complainant to use a domain name featuring the TRAVELEX trademark. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services – on the contrary: The website is designed to mislead Internet users who come across the website that the website is affiliated with and/or is provided by the Complainant as it states “We are Travelex” whilst using the Complainant’s mark and other branding associated with the Complainant and its business. Moreover, the Complainant contends that the Company Profile part of the website addressed by the disputed domain name contains the following statement “Travelex regulated by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) (Money Services Business (MSB) Registration No. 31000294262274).”, although, a search for this MSB number on the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network pulls up another third party “Forxl Markets Inc” whose MSB registration details indicate that it operates in the same field as the Complainant as it deals in foreign exchange and issues traveler’s checks.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith: The Complainant’s TRAVELEX trademark registrations and use of the TRAVELEX mark in general precede the creation date of the disputed domain name for decades and the TRAVELEX mark is distinctive and well known.

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith: The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, online users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s TRAVELEX mark and offerings. The use of the disputed domain name to present the Complainant’s services and featuring the Complainant’s logo and trademarks, gives Internet users a false impression that the site is controlled or authorized by the Complainant.

The website moreover invites Internet users to sign up for an account or a demo account for a trading platform and information on the website suggests that it may be possible to deposit funds with the website. Further, the website encourages Internet users to download “Travelex Trader Software” and redirects them to a third-party website with a domain name registered for a registrant based in Cambodia and associated with a list of scam sites.

All in all, the Complainant submits that the Respondent’s conduct is clearly deceptive.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant submitted evidence which incontestably and conclusively establishes rights in the mark TRAVELEX.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the TRAVELEX mark in which the Complainant has rights since the mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name only adds the word “global” plus the letter “l” at the end which is a common, obvious and intentional misspelling of the word “global” and is therefore considered to be confusingly similar to the TRAVELEX mark of the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 disputed domain name, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the TRAVELEX trademark in any manner. The Respondent did not reply and hence has not rebutted the Complainant’s contentions.

Further, the composition of the disputed domain name (misspelling of the word “global”), coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant’s logo with slightly different color scheme and the TRAVELEX trademark, pretending to be the Complainant (“We are Travelex”), as well as claiming to be a CFD-Trader and prompting users to input login information and open an account, affirms the Respondent’s intention of deceiving Internet users as well as taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website under the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy (e.g., *Robert Ellenbogen v. Mike Pearson*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0001](#)) both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent in bad faith, and
- the disputed domain name is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

(i) In the present case, the Complainant provided evidence which demonstrates that it owns and has rights in the distinctive and well-known registered trademark TRAVELEX, registered and used in many jurisdictions around the world many years before the disputed domain name was registered.

It is therefore inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the mark TRAVELEX, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

This finding is supported by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark TRAVELEX entirely and merely adds the word "global" plus the letter "l" which is a common, obvious and intentional misspelling of such word.

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

(ii) The Complainant has put forward extensive evidence that the disputed domain name was used by the Respondent to resolve to a website featuring the Complainant's logo with slightly different color scheme and TRAVELEX mark and claiming to be the Complainant ("We are Travelex") as well as purporting to be a CFD-Trader and prompting Internet users to input login information and open an account. In doing so, the Respondent gives Internet users the impression that the site is controlled or at least authorized by the Complainant, which is not the case. This clearly disrupts the Complainant's business and shows that the Respondent intentionally attempts to deceive and attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which constitutes bad faith use.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to file a Response and therefore failed to present any evidence of any good faith registration and use with regard to the disputed domain name further prove that the disputed domain name was registered and is used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 <travelexgloball.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: February 26, 2026