ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Strasshill Holdings Limited v. Mark Stone
Case No. D2026-2781

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Strasshill Holdings Limited, Cyprus, represented by MSA IP – Milojevic Sekulic & Associates, Serbia.

The Respondent is Mark Stone, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <skokka.onl> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 25, 2026. On June 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 30, 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 July 3, 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 July 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on July 31, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant designs and develops mobile and desktop platforms. It is also in charge of the hardware, middleware and network administration of the IT infrastructure that runs the websites. The Complainant has operated "www.skokka.com" adult dating website since 2012. The website publishes adult dating service listings divided by countries and cities. It had more than 20 million visits worldwide in April 2026. The Complainant sponsors Esporte Clube Vitória, a Brazilian football club.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for SKOKKA worldwide, e.g., European Union Trade Mark No. 012610374 (registered on July 16, 2014). In addition, the Complainant owns domain names consisting in the wording "skokka", such as <skokka.com> registered since 2012.

The Domain Name was registered on June 19, 2024. The Complainant documents that the Domain Name had resolved to a website used to pass off as the Complainant's official website. On the webpage the Respondent identifies itself as the Complainant, by displaying the Complainant's company information as its own. There is a disclaimer in small text at the very bottom of the front page. At the time of the Decision, the Domain Name resolved to an error page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that its trademark has a wide recognition. The Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's trademark identically, with the Top Level Domain ("TLD") "onl".

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks. To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has not been commonly known by the name "skokka" or "skokka onl". Also, the Complainant is not familiar with any trademark registrations made by the Respondent for SKOKKA or SKOKKA ONL trademarks. Moreover, the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's well-known SKOKKA trademark and for that reason the Respondent cannot reasonably pretend it was intending to develop a legitimate activity through the Domain Name. The Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Respondent "knew or should have known" of the Complainant's trademark rights. Another fact that indicates Respondent's bad faith is that the Respondent employs a privacy shield, eventually to avoid being notified of a UDRP proceeding against it. When the identity of the registrant and contact information was finally revealed, it appears that the Respondent's use of false contact details. This cast doubt on the Respondent's bona fides and support an inference of bad faith registration. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name for a website that impersonates the Complainant and includes content from the Complainant's official website clearly demonstrates that the Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark SKOKKA. The Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel ignores the TLD; see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.

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 the 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Based on the record, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Respondent's use of the Domian Name is evidence of bad faith, see below. Furthermore, the Panel finds that the nature of the Domain Name, which is identical to the Complainant's trademark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation and its use cannot be considered fair as it falsely suggests affiliation. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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.

The fact that the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's priorly registered trademark, and the use of the Domain Name, make it clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. Based on the available record, it appears that the Respondent intended to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Domain Name was used to host an impersonating website, which constitutes bad faith use. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. The current non-use of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Nor does the Respondent's disclaimer, as it was

tucked away in small print at the bottom of the Respondent's webpage and does by itself under the circumstances little to avoid confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. 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 the Domain Name <skokka.onl> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/
Mathias Lilleengen
Sole Panelist
Date: August 11, 2026