

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Zimma Ltd v. huade wang
Case No. D2026-2350

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Zimma Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is huade wang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ticketailor.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 31, 2026. On June 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 1, 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 June 3, 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 June 5, 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 June 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Charles Gielen as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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 online event ticketing and event management platform and provides ticketing and box office solutions for event organizers across a broad range of industries and sectors, including live entertainment, festivals, conferences, museums, charities, sports events, educational institutions, and community organizations. The platform allows organizers to create event pages, sell tickets online, manage attendee registration, conduct event check-ins, and integrate with numerous third-party applications and payment processors. The Complainant currently serves tens of thousands of event organizers in more than 120 countries worldwide and processes millions of event tickets annually. The Complainant processed more than 25 million tickets in 2024 alone, following consecutive years of rapid expansion and increasing international adoption. It uses the trade mark TICKET TAILOR for its services.

The Complainant owns various registrations for its trade mark TICKET TAILOR in different jurisdictions, such as United Kingdom Registration No. 00003090716, registered on April 17, 2015, for goods in class 16, and services in class 41, and International Registration No. 1759520, registered on September 14, 2023 for goods in classes 9 and 16, and services in classes 36, 41 and 42, covering among others, Australia, the European Union, and the United States of America.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <tickettailor.com>, through which its services are offered for sale.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 8, 2018, and resolves to a pay-per-click (“PPC”) parking page displaying links to third-party websites that advertise the services of other businesses, which compete with, or are related to those of the Complainant.

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 the Complainant’s trade mark. It incorporates the Complainant’s registered trade mark TICKET TAILOR in its entirety with the omission of a letter “t”. The omission of the letter “t” in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Complainant’s TICKET TAILOR trade mark and the disputed domain name, as the trade mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and gives several reasons for this. First, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor is the Respondent otherwise authorized to use the Complainant’s trade mark for any purpose. Second, the Complainant found no evidence showing that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or owns any registered trade marks including the term “ticketailor” or “ticketailor.com”. Third, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the disputed domain name resolves to a PPC parking page displaying links to third-party websites that advertise the services of other businesses which compete with or are related to those of the Complainant. The Respondent is therefore using the disputed domain name to misleadingly divert Internet users seeking the Complainant to third-party commercial websites for the Respondent’s commercial gain. Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant also argues that the lack of rights and legitimate interests is demonstrated by the fact that the Respondent has been a respondent in over 15 UDRP disputes involving over 150 domain names, many of which concerned the registration of typosquatted versions of third-party trade marks.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. With respect to the registration, the Complainant contends that it is a global provider of online ticketing and event management services. The Complainant operates internationally and enjoys a strong online presence. Its ticketing platform is used by customers in over 120 countries and processes millions of event tickets annually. It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant or its trade mark TICKET TAILOR when it registered the disputed domain name. On the contrary, it seems that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's rights, given that the disputed domain name is an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trade mark TICKET TAILOR, differing only by the omission of one letter "t". Such registration is a clear example of typosquatting. UDRP panels have held that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a well-known trade mark can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Regarding the bad faith use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to resolve to a PPC parking page displaying sponsored links related to competing ticketing services. By using a typosquatted variation of the Complainant's trade mark in the disputed domain name and directing it to a page displaying third-party advertisement links, from where the Respondent most likely obtains a revenue, the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark TICKET TAILOR as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. The bad faith intentions of the Respondent are also demonstrated by the fact that the Respondent appears to have engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct by registering multiple trade mark-abusive domain names (either in full or as typosquatting variations) corresponding to the distinct trade marks of other brand owners.

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

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark TICKET TAILOR. It contains the Complainant's trade mark and the only difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark is that in the disputed domain name one letter "t" was omitted. This difference does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the trade mark and the disputed domain name as the trade mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Therefore, the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is met.

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.

First, the Respondent is default and did not show that it owns any rights to the name “ticketailor” nor that it has any license or other authorization from the Complainant to use its trade mark TICKET TAILOR. Second, based on the available record, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by, or that it has ever been known under the name “ticketailor”. Furthermore, the Panel did not find any evidence on the available record that the Respondent has used, or prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Panel also notes the notoriety of the Complainant’s trade mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, almost identical to the Complainant’s own domain name, and that the disputed domain name resolves to a PPC page displaying links to third party websites that advertise the services of other businesses which compete with or are related to those of the Complainant. Such circumstances prevent a finding of rights or legitimate interests for the Respondent.

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.

With respect to the registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent more likely than not had the trade mark of the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name. It is unlikely that the Respondent would not have known the existence of the trade mark of the Complainant used in so many countries in the world and which predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s rights, given that the disputed domain name is an intentional misspelling of the Complainant’s trade mark TICKET TAILOR and domain name, differing only by the omission of one letter “t”. Such registration is a clear example of typosquatting. The bad faith use of the disputed domain name is established by the use of a typosquatted variation of the Complainant’s trade mark and domain name in the disputed domain name, resolving to a page containing PPC third-party advertisement links, from where the Respondent most likely obtains revenue. In doing so, the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trade mark TICKET TAILOR. Such use is use in 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 <ticketailor.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Charles Gielen/

Charles Gielen

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026