

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

SeatGeek v. Karl Schnurch, EdenMedia  
Case No. D2023-4112

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is SeatGeek, United States of America (the “United States”), represented by Soteria LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Karl Schnurch, EdenMedia, Seychelles.

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

The disputed domain name <seatgee.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 2, 2023. On October 3, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On October 3, 2023, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 11, 2023, 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 October 11, 2023.

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 October 12, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 1, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 13, 2023.

The Center appointed Gregor Vos as the sole panelist in this matter on December 14, 2023. 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 company acting as a mobile-focused ticket platform that enables users to buy and sell tickets for various events.

The Complainant is the owner of the United States Trade Mark registration with No. 4062477 for the sign SEATGEEK, registered on November 29, 2011 (the "Trademark").

Further, it is undisputed that the Complainant is the holder of the domain name <seatgeek.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on June 19, 2021, and at the time of filing the Complaint resolved to a website of a competitor 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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant first contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trademark, with the mere difference that the letter 'k' is missing.

Second, the Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has never received authorization from the Complainant to use the Trademark in the Domain Name and is not commonly known by the Domain Name.

Finally, according to the Complainant, the Respondent was aware of the Trademark when registering the Domain Name and is using the Domain Name to redirect Internet users to the website of a competitor of the Complainant.

##### **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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Trademark is recognizable within the Domain Name, with the mere deletion of the letter “k” which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7 and 1.9.

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.

Although 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 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 3.0](#), 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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Trademark is registered and used by the Complainant for many years. The Complainant’s rights to the Trademark predate the registration date of the Domain Name. In light of the fact that the Domain Name incorporates the Trademark in its entirety with the mere deletion of the final letter and the fact that the Domain Name resolved to a website of a competitor of the Complainant, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that it is not conceivable that the Respondent chose the Domain Name without knowledge of the Complainant’s activities and its Trademark under which the Complainant is doing business.

Further, in light of the absence of any legitimate interest in the Domain Name and in light of the fact that the Domain Name resolved to a website of a competitor of the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent is using the Domain Name with the intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain.

Based on the available record, 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 Domain Name <seatgee.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gregor Vos/*

**Gregor Vos**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 28, 2023