ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Microsoft Corporation v. Park HyungJin
Case No. D2026-1185

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Microsoft Corporation, United States of America (the “United States”), represented by Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is Park HyungJin, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rnicrosoft.com> is registered with TurnCommerce, Inc. DBA NameBright.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 19, 2026. On March 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 19, 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 March 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 March 24, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Petra Pecar as the sole panelist in this matter on May 4, 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 global information technology company founded in 1975. The Complainant develops and provides personal computer software systems and applications, cloud computing services, video games, online services, hardware products, cybersecurity solutions, and artificial intelligence tools. The Complainant operates internationally through subsidiaries, affiliates and licensees and, as of September 30, 2025, had subsidiaries in about 120 countries worldwide and an employee headcount of 228,000 worldwide, including 125,000 in the United States and 103,000 internationally.

The Complainant owns several mark registrations worldwide protecting MICROSOFT, including the following:

- The United States word mark MICROSOFT Registration No. 1256083, registered on November 1, 1983 in International Class 16;
- European Union word mark MICROSOFT Registration No. 000330910, registered on May 7, 1999, in International Classes 35, 41, and 42;
- International device mark Registration No. 1142097, registered on August 22, 2012, designating among others Republic of Korea, in International Classes 9, 16, 25, 28, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 45.

The Complainant operates Internet websites at domain names incorporating the MICROSOFT name and mark, including <microsoft.com> and <microsoft.net>, which provide information regarding the Complainant and its products and services.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 25, 2012, and at the time of the Complaint filing it resolved to an inactive webpage.

Respondent is located in Republic of Korea.

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 its MICROSOFT mark is well known and that previous panels have recognized it as world famous. The Complainant further contends that it owns registered rights in the MICROSOFT mark in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the MICROSOFT mark because it adopts the visually similar "rnicrosoft" variant, in which the letters "r" and "n" are combined to imitate the letter "m". According to the Complainant, this constitutes an intentional misspelling of its MICROSOFT mark and an act of typosquatting or homograph spoofing. The Complainant also submits that the MICROSOFT mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name and that the applicable generic Top-Level Domain (hereinafter: "gTLD") does not affect the assessment of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, it has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the MICROSOFT mark, any confusingly similar mark, or to register a domain name incorporating such mark or a variation thereof. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant began using and registered the MICROSOFT mark, and that, given the well-known status of the mark, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant also states that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage, that there is no evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not known to the Complainant and has no relationship with the Complainant or its MICROSOFT mark. Given the well-known status of the MICROSOFT mark, the Complainant argues that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent's selection of a visually similar variant of the MICROSOFT mark was not coincidental. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name constitutes typosquatting and homograph spoofing, as it replaces the letter "m" with the visually similar combination "rn". According to the Complainant, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith, particularly where the mark is well known, the Respondent has no authorization, there is no evidence of any good-faith use, and there are indications that the disputed domain name has been used for phishing purposes through emails containing the Complainant's MICROSOFT mark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Even if the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complainant's contentions, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant. "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable", as indicated in paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

(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 by the Respondent 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 MICROSOFT mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. The disputed domain name consists of a misspelled version of the Complainant's MICROSOFT mark, replacing the initial letter "m" with the visually similar combination of the letters "r" and "n". This alteration does not prevent the Complainant's mark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, it is well accepted practice by UDRP panels that a gTLD, such as ".com", is typically disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark (see section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1). For that reason, the Panel accepts not to take into consideration the gTLD ".com" when assessing confusing similarity of the disputed domain name.

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.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated with, connected to, or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the MICROSOFT mark or to register a domain name incorporating such mark or a variation thereof. The Complainant further states that the disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant had commenced use of and registered its MICROSOFT mark, and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any corresponding name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, which the Respondent has not rebutted. The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage, and there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. In addition, the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's MICROSOFT mark by replacing the letter "m" with the visually similar combination "rn", signals an intention on the part of the Respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant and does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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 notes that the disputed domain name was registered approximately 29 years after the registration of the Complainant's MICROSOFT mark and long after the Complainant had commenced use of the MICROSOFT mark. The disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of the MICROSOFT mark, replacing the letter "m" with the visually similar combination "rn". Moreover, the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's domain name <microsoft.com>, which supports the inference that the Respondent sought to create a misleading association with the Complainant. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent for its choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that the registration of the disputed domain name was unlikely to have been coincidental.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive webpage. In the circumstances of this case, including the well-known character of the MICROSOFT mark, the Respondent's lack of authorization, and the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name does not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Rather, panels assess the totality of the circumstances in each case. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the well-known character of the Complainant's MICROSOFT mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, which replaces the letter "m" with the visually similar combination "rn", and the fact that the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's domain name <microsoft.com>. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, but to an error page stating "Hmmm… can't reach this page" and "Check if there is a typo in rnicrosoft.com," with a suggestion to visit <microsoft.com>. In these circumstances, and in the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <rnicrosoft.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Petra Pecar/
Petra Pecar
Sole Panelist
Date: May 18, 2026