ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Beggars Group Limited v. Anna Anna
Case No. D2026-0847

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Beggars Group Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Sipara Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Anna Anna, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <beggarmusic.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 February 26, 2026. On February 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 2, 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 (Information not available) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 2, 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 March 4, 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 March 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Olga Zalomiy as the sole panelist in this matter on March 1, 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 British record company. The Complainant's business reported revenues of USD 140 million in 2024.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for its BEGGARS GROUP trademarks, and a registration for the BEGGARS mark, such as:

-The Chinese registration No. 43203490 for the BEGGARS (stylized word) registered on December 21, 2020;
-The International registration No. 868592 for the BEGGARS GROUP mark registered on January 20, 2005; and
-The United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00904100749 for the BEGGARS GROUP mark registered on January 18, 2006.

The Complainant registered a domain name that includes its BEGGARS trademark, such as: <beggars.com>. Beggars Music Limited is an independent music publisher and a subsidiary of the Complainant.

The Respondent, who is an individual purportedly located in Malaysia, registered the disputed domain name on May 20, 2025. The disputed domain name directs Internet users to a website purportedly belonging to Beggar Music Management Ltd that offers music rights management, licensing, digital distribution of music and artist support and development. The website under the disputed domain name has a tab with a white paper which states that "Beggar Music Management Ltd is a wholly owned subsidiary of Beggar GROUP LIMITED, founded in 2024 and located in London, UK". According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, a company called "Beggar Group Management Ltd" was incorporated in 2025 in the United Kingdom. There is no evidence that Beggar Group Limited exists.

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks because it fully reproduces the dominant element "beggar" from the Complainant's marks (identical to the unusual spelling of the singular form "begger" in the mark) and adds the descriptive term "music". The Complainant asserts that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not affect the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark. In the alternative, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its subsidiary's unregistered mark BEGGARS MUSIC, with the omission of the letter "s" and the addition of the gTLD ".com". The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name differs from its domain name <beggarsmusic.com> by one letter, which increases any likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to falsely imply an association with the Complainant to divert web traffic. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks and is being used to offer similar music publishing services. Despite the website's claim of decades of prior use, the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter or provide any substantiation of their alleged business history.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and was therefore fully aware of its existence. It maintains that it is unlikely the Respondent would have established a business without conducting due diligence, particularly given that the term "beggars" is highly unusual and distinctive. The Complainant submits that the incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name, without any plausible explanation, is indicative of bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks and trade names "Beggars" and "Beggars music". It further alleges that the Respondent has made numerous statements on the website to create a false appearance of legitimacy, which are unsupported by the facts and appear designed to mislead users into believing that the website is owned by, or commercially affiliated with, the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed in these proceedings, the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each of the disputed domain names:

(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 in respect of 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 Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the BEGGARS and BEGGARS GROUP trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the marks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. The inclusion of the gTLD ".com" is typically disregarded in the context of the confusing similarity assessment, being a technical requirement of registration. WIPO Overview 3.1., section 1.11.1.

Although the addition of other terms here, the term "music", 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.

Furthermore, it is well-established that "a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element". WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9. Here, the BEGGARS trademark is misspelled in the disputed domain name (the omission of the letter "s" after the letter "r"). The difference between the Complainant's BEGGARS GROUP trademark and the disputed domain name is the omission of the letter "s" after the letter "r" and replacement of the word "group" with the word "music". Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

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.

The evidence on record indicates that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark in a domain name. The Respondent is also not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the website associated with the disputed domain name suggests an affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent by claiming to be a subsidiary of a seemingly non-existent company whose name differs from the Complainant's by only one letter. In these circumstances, the Respondent's activities — appearing to use the website associated with the disputed domain name for passing off by mimicking the relationship between the Complainant and its subsidiary Beggars Music Limited — also cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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, who has no connection to the Complainant, registered a disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks in order to capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill. This is evidenced by statements on the website associated with the disputed domain name that falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. Thus, the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The UDRP establishes that, for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii), "bad faith" registration and use of a domain name can be established by a showing of circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the respondent's website or location, or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location. See Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Prior UDRP panels have found "the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark: (i) actual confusion, (ii) seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, (iii) the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, […]" WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. First, the white paper available on the website associated with the disputed domain name states that "Beggar Music Management Ltd", the purported owner of the website, "is a wholly owned subsidiary of Beggar GROUP LIMITED, founded in 2024 and located in London, UK". However, there is no evidence that the purported parent company whose name differs from the Complainant's by only one letter exists and the purported subsidiary was incorporated in May 2025. In the Panel's view, this claimed corporate setup is a deliberate attempt to mimic the legitimate relationship between the Complainant and its subsidiary, Beggars Music Limited. Despite this, the website presents itself as an established music publisher, claiming that "the company has grown to become a global leader in rights, publishing and synchronization licensing"—a description that closely mirrors the Complainant's business, which reported revenues of USD140 million in 2024. Additionally, the white paper asserts that "over the past decade, Beggar Group has continued to grow and develop" thereby suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant and reinforcing the impression that the Respondent is seeking to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation.

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 <beggarmusic.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Olga Zalomiy/
Olga Zalomiy
Sole Panelist
Date: April 15, 2026