

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Wise Digital Partners, LLC v. Walter Salazar  
Case No. D2026-1799

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Wise Digital Partners, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Vos-IP, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Walter Salazar, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <digitalseat.com> 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 April 27, 2026. On April 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 28, 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 (Doe(s)1-10) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 29, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 April 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 21, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on May 21, 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 limited liability company established under the laws of the State of Texas, United States, with a principal place of business in North Richland Hills, Texas. The Panel notes that according to the online database of the Texas Comptroller, the Complainant first registered with the state's franchise tax authority on January 28, 2026.<sup>1</sup> The Complainant submitted documentation with the Complaint showing that on February 16, 2026, the Complainant acquired substantially all of the assets of Digital Seat Media Inc. of Fort Worth, Texas following an auction conducted by the court-appointed trustee in the bankruptcy proceedings concerning that company, *In Re Digital Seat Media, Inc.*, Chapter 7 Case No:25-41668-elm7 (United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas). The bankruptcy court approved this purchase on March 4, 2026. The purchase evidently included the assets of Digital Seat Media, LLC ("DSM"), a Texas limited liability company that held three trademarks used by Digital Seat Media, including the DIGITAL SEAT mark on which this UDRP Complaint is based.

Digital Seat Media, Inc. ("Digital Seat Media") was registered with the Texas franchise tax authority on November 2, 2019, according to the authority's online database. The Complaint says that Digital Seat Media started using the DIGITAL SEAT mark in January 2019 in connection with offering a service of targeted advertising to consumers via their smartphones and mobile computers, based on the user scanning a machine readable code at an entertainment venue or other locations.

The online database of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") shows that DSM was the entity that applied for trademark registration of DIGITAL SEAT as a standard character mark, on an intent to use basis, on October 9, 2018. The mark was registered on May 5, 2020 (Registration Number 6048570) in international class 35. The Complaint attaches a copy of the trademark assignment effective March 27, 2026, transferring DSM's interest in the DIGITAL SEAT trademark registration to the Complainant (the assignment does not yet appear on the USPTO database at the time of this Decision).

The Complaint does not detail when and how Digital Seat Media used the DIGITAL SEAT MEDIA mark, beyond the description above, which is found in the trademark registration. The Panel notes that the trademark registration also reports first use in commerce on January 3, 2019. It is clear that at some point in 2018 Digital Seat Media acquired the disputed domain name, which the Registrar reports as created in 2015. The Panel notes that screenshots available from the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine show that the disputed domain name resolved to a landing page advertising the disputed domain name for sale as late as 2017, and then in August 2018 there is an archived screenshot of a "Digital Seat Media" landing page advertising the Digital Seat Media's "coming" website, with a contact form to send messages to Digital Seat Media. From July 2019 through July 2025, there are archived screenshots of the Digital Seat Media website, advertising a business of placing programmable, weather-resistant tags with QR codes on seatbacks in sports stadiums and other event venues. These allowed guests to scan the QR codes with their smartphones, reaching websites operated by the venue or event sponsor with pertinent information and advertising, such as event programs, maps, game scores, fan polls and interactive games, order forms for in-seat food and merchandise purchases, and information about upcoming events.

---

<sup>1</sup> Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

The Panel notes that Digital Seat Media filed for bankruptcy in May 2025, and it is not clear on this record exactly when Digital Seat Media ceased functioning or how it lost control of the disputed domain name and the associated website that it used for its business for at least six years before declaring bankruptcy. At the time of this Decision, the Panel notes that a landing page at “www.digitalseat.media” presents a “Coming Soon” message saying that this page “will become the new public destination for Digital Seat fan experiences”. That domain name was registered on February 26, 2026, ten days after the Complainant acquired the assets of Digital Seat Media. There are no archived screenshots of the Digital Seat Media website in the latter part of 2025 or early 2026, and it appears likely that the bankrupt company allowed its registration of the disputed domain name to lapse.

The Complaint attaches a copy of the Whois record showing that the registration details were “updated” on April 2, 2026. This is likely when the disputed domain name was acquired by the current registrant. The Registrar reports that this is the Respondent Walter Salazar, listing a postal address in the State of California, United States, and a Gmail contact email address.

At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that patently imitated the former Digital Seat Media website, copying much of its content, including the DIGITAL SEAT MEDIA figurative logo. Like the former Digital Seat Media website, the Respondent’s website had a home page with a lively video of a sports arena and tabs for “Sports”, “Entertainment”, “Education”, “News”, and “More”, and links to social media sites. The tagline on the home page read, “Any Venue. Any Device. No App Required. Get To Know Every Fun. In Every Seat. At Every Event.” The site referred to scannable QR codes on tags affixed to seats at sports stadiums and other event venues, allowing guests to reach websites displaying programs, game scores, stadium maps, fan polls, menus for in-seat food and merchandise orders, information about upcoming events, and other content. The home page displayed the numbers of “Module Engagements”, “Tags Deployed”, “Venue Installs”, and “Brand Partners”, but at the time of this Decision, the numbers are all oddly set at 0 or 0+. (This is obviously not a strong selling point for potential clients, but it is a phenomenon that often occurs on AI-generated websites that typically insert meaningless counters on copycat websites without human review.) The site included the names and logos of clients. The Respondent’s website invited visitors to furnish their contact details or to call or email the site operator, identified in the header, footer, and copyright notice as Digital Seat Media. The copyright notice is dated 2023, another sign that the material is copied from an outdated version of the former Digital Seat Media website.

The Respondent has not replied to an April 2026 cease-and-desist letter from the Complainant or to communications in connection with this proceeding.

## **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 identical to the registered DIGITAL SEAT mark that the Complainant now owns. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is not authorized to use the mark, and also that there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by a corresponding name or is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Rather, the Complainant contends that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name recently with “actual or constructive knowledge” of the registered DIGITAL SEAT mark, imitated the Digital Seat Media website and copied its content, disrupted the business of the Complainant as successor to the business of Digital Seat Media, passively held the disputed domain name “using Complainant’s copyrighted content”, and intentionally created confusion with the mark to misdirect Internet users for commercial gain. These acts represent bad faith under the Policy.

## **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 trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered DIGITAL SEAT word 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. 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.

It appears on this record that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in 2026 after Digital Seat Media, a business falling into bankruptcy, allowed the domain name registration to lapse and ceased using the disputed domain name to promote its business. The Respondent then republished a website associated with the disputed domain name that essentially copied the former website of Digital Seat Media and allowed the Respondent to collect contact details from site visitors. There is no evidence that the Respondent actually operates a corresponding business or has made demonstrable preparations to do so, and in the circumstances of this case any such activity likely would entail trademark and copyright infringement and therefore could not be considered a “bona fide” commercial offering under the Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i).

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 Complainant’s references to principles of constructive notice and passive holding are inapposite and unnecessary. The Respondent was clearly aware of Digital Seat Media and intended to attract Internet users to the Respondent’s website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Digital Seat Media mark, consistent with the example of bad faith given in the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

As detailed above, it is probable that the Respondent acquired the expired disputed domain name formerly used for some six years by Digital Seat Media for its website and then republished an imitative website with copied material, including the Digital Seat Media logo, purporting to offer precisely the same products and services as Digital Seat Media (and possibly by its successor following the bankruptcy). The record does not indicate whether the Respondent actually communicates with potential clients and attempts to offer such services or simply harvests contact details as part of a phishing scheme, but the Respondent’s website bears indicia of falseness: it identified a website operator that no longer exists as a going concern, using a mark and logo that belong to another party, with outdated content copyrighted three years ago by another party, and phony success counters set perpetually to zero.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a website that refers to “fan experiences”. This affirms the Respondent’s bad faith since this website was modified only after the Complaint was notified to the Respondent.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that, according to the public online database of WIPO UDRP cases, the same Respondent was also the respondent in another recent UDRP proceeding, *Central Way Sasu v. Walter Salazar*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0110](#), where the panel ordered the transfer of a domain name incorporating the mark of a French retailer of men’s clothing. The panel found that the respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate the complainant or create a false affiliation with the complainant in that proceeding, publishing a website with photographs of clothing allegedly copied from the complainant’s website and (as in the current proceeding) displaying the complainant’s figurative mark on the respondent’s website. Hence, the Respondent was caught out recently in a similar UDRP proceeding, registering a lapsed or hacked domain name and using it for an imitative website. Moreover, the Respondent has not come forward to offer a legitimate rationale for his conduct.

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 <digitalseat.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/W. Scott Blackmer/*

**W. Scott Blackmer**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 22, 2026