ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Jagex Limited v. gao jian hua
Case No. D2026-2060

1. The Parties

Complainant is Jagex Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Stobbs IP Limited, UK.

Respondent is gao jian hua, China, represented by Cornerstone Law Firm, United States of America ("USA").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <runemate.com> is registered with Bizcn.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 13, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 18, 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 Complainant on May 21, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on May 26, 2026.

On May 21, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On May 26, 2026, Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding.

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 Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 16, 2026. On June 16, 2026, Respondent requested for automatic response extension. Accordingly, the due date for Response was extended to June 20, 2026. The Response in English was filed with the Center on June 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on July 6, 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.

On July 7, 2026, the Complainant requested that the proceeding be suspended to facilitate settlement discussions with the Respondent. On July 13, 2026, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1, suspending the proceeding. On September 1, 2026, the Complainant requested the reinstitution of the proceeding. On September 10, 2026, the Panel instructed the Center to inform the Parties that the proceeding had been reinstituted.

4. Factual Background

A. Complainant

Complainant, Jagex Limited, is a company incorporated in the UK. It was incorporated on April 28, 2000 and is engaged in designing, developing, publishing, and operating online video games and other electronic-based entertainment (Annex 4 to the Complaint). Complainant is internationally known for its massively multiplayer online role-playing games RuneScape and Old School RuneScape (also referred to as "OSRS") (collectively, the "Games") (Annexes 5 and 6 to the Complaint). The Games have a substantial international user base (Annex 7 to the Complaint). Complainant also owns the domain name <runescape.com>, which has resolved to an active website relating to online video games since at least August 2000 (Annex 8 to the Complaint).

Complainant has rights in the RUNE, RUNESCAPE, and RUNE-related trademarks. Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations, including, inter alia: UK Trade Mark Registration No. UK00002302308 for RUNESCAPE, registered on December 27, 2002; UK Trade Mark Registration No. UK00911161239 for RUNE, registered on October 9, 2013; European Union ("EU") Trade Mark Registration No. 011161239 for RUNE, registered on October 9, 2013; and EU Trade Mark Registration No. 018622946 for RUNE, registered on May 20, 2022 (Annex 14 to the Complaint).

B. Respondent

Respondent is Gao Jian Hua, China.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 30, 2013. It resolves to a website operating under the name "RuneMate" which concerns Complainant's Games (Annexes 2 and 16 to the Complaint). The website's homepage offers "RuneMate" software for download, describing it as "the ultimate destination for botting, enjoying, and maximizing Old School RuneScape". The website also includes, among other things, a community forum and a "Bot Store" displaying software bots for use in connection with the Games, including free and paid bots (Annex 3 to the Complaint; Annexes 1 and 2 to the Response).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its RUNE trademark. The addition of "mate" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity (Annex 14 to the Complaint).

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, including because the website offers bots for use in Complainant's Games (Annexes 3 and 20 to the Complaint).

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith (Annexes 16, 21 and 22 to the Complaint).

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that the disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, arguing that "rune" is a common word and that "mate" distinguishes the disputed domain name.

Respondent contends that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, which it uses as a RuneScape fan site and community forum, and that the bots are supplied by independent third parties (Annexes 1 and 2 to the Response).

Respondent denies bad faith and requests that the Complaint be denied.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English, and the Respondent expressly consented to English in its Response.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. In particular, Complainant has established registered trademark rights in RUNE. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's RUNE trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "mate". The addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Respondent argues that "rune" is a common word and that "mate" distinguishes the disputed domain name. These arguments do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, where Complainant's RUNE trademark remains recognizable in the disputed domain name.

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 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 in the domain name. 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has sought to rebut Complainant's prima facie case, principally on the basis that the disputed domain name is used for a RuneScape fan site and community forum and that the bots are created and supplied by independent third parties. The Panel, however, finds Respondent's arguments and evidence insufficient to establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

More specifically:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent contends that the disputed domain name is used for a RuneScape fan site and community forum and that the bots are created and supplied by independent third parties. However, the website includes a "Bot Store" through which bots for use with Complainant's Games are organized and made available, including on a paid basis (Annex 3 to the Complaint; Annexes 1 and 2 to the Response). Moreover, the website's homepage offers "RuneMate" software for download, describing it as "the ultimate destination for botting, enjoying, and maximizing Old School RuneScape". There is no disclaimer clarifying the lack of relationship between the Complainant and Respondent. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use its trademarks or to register or use any domain name incorporating Complainant's trademarks. Although there is a community forum on the Respondent's website, the Panel considers that the Respondent's website is not a genuine fan site, but is primarily used to offer Respondent's own "RuneMate" software and offering bots through the "Bot Store". WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.7;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name. As noted above, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's RUNE trademark; and

(iii) Respondent contends that it is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name because the website operates as a RuneScape fan site and community forum. However, the record shows that the website is not merely a noncommercial fan forum. The website's homepage offers "RuneMate" software for download, and its "Bot Store" displaying bots specifically for use with Complainant's Games, including free and paid offerings (Annex 3 to the Complaint; Annexes 1 and 2 to the Response). On the available record, the Panel finds Respondent's arguments and evidence insufficient to establish a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 30, 2013 (Annex 1 to the Complaint). Complainant's RUNESCAPE trademark had been registered for many years by that time, although the RUNE trademark registrations relied upon in the Complaint were registered subsequently in October 2013 (Annex 14 to the Complaint). The Panel therefore does not rely merely on those later RUNE registrations in assessing Respondent's knowledge at the time of registration.

Based on the information provided by the Parties, the Panel finds that Respondent had Complainant and its RuneScape Games in mind when registering the disputed domain name. Respondent itself acknowledges that the website is a RuneScape fan site and that "RuneMate" website under the disputed domain name exists to facilitate users' interest in playing RuneScape. This is further reinforced by the fact that the website under the disputed domain name is specifically directed to Complainant's Games and makes available bots for use with those Games, including on a paid basis (Annex 3 to the Complaint; Annexes 1 and 2 to the Response).

Respondent argues that "rune" is a common word and that the bots are created and supplied by independent third parties. However, the website's homepage offers the Respondent's "RuneMate" software for download, and the website includes a "Bot Store" through which bots for Complainant's Games are organized and made available, including paid offerings (Annex 3 to the Complaint; Annexes 1 and 2 to the Response). Accordingly, the Panel concludes that Respondent is using the confusingly similar disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 that the disputed domain name <runemate.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/
Yijun Tian
Sole Panelist
Date: September 16, 2026