

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MBC FZ IP LLC v. ahmad mibayyad

Case No. D2026-0181

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MBC FZ IP LLC, United Arab Emirates, represented by Al Tamimi & Company, United Arab Emirates.

The Respondent is ahmad mibayyad, Denmark.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mbcshahid.com> (the “Domain Name”) 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 January 16, 2026. On January 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On January 16, 2026, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 20, 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 25, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on February 19, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is part of MBC Group, which is a large Middle East television broadcaster. MBC Group operates over 19 free-to-air satellite TV channels, and the video-on-demand service “Shahid” which is the most watched Arabic streaming service in the Middle East and North Africa. The Complainant’s social media reaches over 760 million followers globally.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for MBC and SHAHID globally, such as European Union Trademark 9843913 (registered on March 28, 2011) for SHAHID.NET and European Union Trademark 000844910 (registered March 29, 2005) for MBC. The Complainant has registered over 400 domain names containing the MBC or SHAHID trademarks such as <mbcshahid.co> and <mbcshahid.net>.

The Domain Name appears to be registered on July 21, 2015. The Domain Name resolves to an error webpage.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that the trademarks have acquired strong recognition over the years. The Domain Name reproduces the Complainant’s two trademarks MBC and SHAHID. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to MBC's name and trademarks.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not permitted the Respondent to use its trademarks. The mere registration of the Domain Name does not establish rights or legitimate interests in it. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. The Domain Name appears to be inactive but there is a risk that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name to divert Internet users.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the Domain Name in bad faith. The Respondent was aware and had constructive notice of the Complainant’s rights. The Domain Name was registered two to three years after the Complainant started using the SHAHID trademark, nearly ten years after the Complainant started using the MBC trademark and fourteen years after the Complainant started its broadcasting services. The Respondent hoped to freeride on the Complainant’s goodwill. The non-use of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Moreover, the Respondent appears to be connected to illegal IPTV operations which further underlines bad faith.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademarks MBC and SHAHID. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD"); see [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. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [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 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. Based on the record, 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. Finally, it is inconceivable that the Respondent may put the Domain Name into any good faith use as it is identical to the Complainant's two trademarks combined together.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the nature of the Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

The fact that the Domain Name is almost identical to the Complainant's two prior registered trademarks makes it probable that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name.

Based on the case file, it appears that the Respondent selected the Domain Name precisely due to its similarity with the Complainant's two trademarks. The non-use of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. The Complainant is a well-known broadcaster; the Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use. As mentioned above, it appears implausible that the Respondent may put the Domain Name into any good faith use, because of the Complainant's prior rights and the misleading composition of the Domain Name. Moreover, the fact that the Respondent appears to be involved in possibly illegal IPTV operations further points to bad faith.

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 the Domain Name <mbcshahid.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: February 23, 2026