

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Electronic Arts Inc. v. Do Chung
Case No. D2026-1013

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Electronic Arts Inc., United States of America (“U.S.”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Do Chung, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <plantsvszombies.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 9, 2026. On March 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 11, 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 Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 12, 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 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 March 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 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 asserted to be a global leader in digital interactive entertainment, which was founded in 1982. Headquartered in Redwood City, California in the U.S., the Complainant develops games, content and online services for Internet-connected consoles, mobile devices, and personal computers.

The Complainant maintains a primary website at “www.ea.com”. According to Similarweb.com, the Complainant’s said website averaged 62.3 million visits between March 2025 and May 2025, ranking it as the 692nd most popular website in the world.

The Complainant’s subsidiary game studio, PopCap Games, Inc., developed the “Plants vs. Zombies” video game in 2004. The game was released in 2009 and is asserted to have become a cultural phenomenon. It has received multiple industry awards.

The Complainant’s URL at “www.ea.com/games/plants-vs-zombies” has become a popular repository for information about all eight Plants vs. Zombies games and related goods and services. On Google Play, the Plants vs. Zombies mobile application has been downloaded by more than 500 million users. Apple Store ranked it as “#24 in Action” with a 4.8 stars rating.

The Complainant’s PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark is stated to be well recognized worldwide and respected in its industry. Significant investments have been made by the Complainant to advertise and promote the PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark worldwide. As a result, substantial goodwill has been developed in the Plants vs. Zombies brand.

The Complainant’s PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark has been registered in many jurisdictions. The Complainant’s trade mark registrations for PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES include the following:

- (i) U.S. Registration No. 3851667, registered on September 21, 2010;
- (ii) U.S. Registration No. 4023131, registered on September 6, 2011;
- (iii) United Kingdom Registration No. UK00908259426, registered on December 3, 2009;
- (iv) European Union Registration No. 008259426, registered on December 3, 2009; and
- (v) International Registration No. 1010010, registered on May 21, 2009.

The Complainant also owns domain names that incorporate the PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark, such as <plantsvszombies.com>, <plantvszombie.com>, and <plantvszombieplush.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 9, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website which purports to offer an online shop for Plants vs. Zombies “officially licensed merchandise like T-shirts, hoodies, accessories, and exclusive collectibles”.

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 the following:

(i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark is reproduced in its entirety in the disputed domain name.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with or sponsored by the Complainant. The Respondent has not been given permission or a licence to use the Complainant's PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark in any manner, including in domain names. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant's PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark was registered and first used in 2009. At the time of filing the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that includes the Complainant's PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES logo and copyright-protected images, and which claims to be a "Plants vs. Zombies" shop. Respondent has attempted to pass off its website as being affiliated with the Complainant.

Even if the products offered on the Respondent's website were legitimate products originating from the Complainant, Respondent is not an unauthorized reseller or distributor and fails the Oki Data test. In particular, the Respondent fails to accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent's relationship with the trade mark holder. There is no visible disclaimer on the Respondent's website stating that it is not endorsed or sponsored by the Complainant, nor to declare the non-existing relationship with the trade mark holder. The false impression is thereby given that the Respondent is authorized to use the Complainant's PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark and to sell the Complainant's products.

(iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's PLANTS VS. ZOMBIES trade mark is known internationally and is so closely linked to and associated with the Complainant that the Respondent's use of the trade mark strongly implies bad faith. The Respondent clearly knows and is familiar with the Complainant's brand and business.

B. Respondent

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

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 trade mark 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 trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The “.shop” generic Top-Level Domain is a technical requirement and not relevant to the issue of identity or confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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. Furthermore, the fact that the disputed domain name comprises the entirety of the Complainant’s trade mark is significant. As a general principle, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trade mark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1, states that panels have recognized that resellers using a domain name containing the complainant’s trade mark to undertake sales related to the complainant’s goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. This “Oki Data test” which the Complainant referred to stipulates that the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- “(i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder;
and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the trademark.”

In this case, the Panel agrees that the Respondent’s website fails in relation to the third requirement.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

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 finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith for these reasons:

- (i) the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's well-known mark in its entirety;
- (ii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to seemingly profit commercially from the reputation of the Complainant's trade mark, and by giving the false association of association with, or authorization by the Complainant;
- (iii) the blatant use of copyright-protected content and the Complainant's logo on the Respondent's website without the Complainant's consent; and
- (iv) the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint and finding of the absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel accordingly 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 <plantsvszombies.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/

Francine Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: April 29, 2026