

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Virgin Enterprises Limited v. ASHIA ZAHRNI  
Case No. D2024-2447

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Virgin Enterprises Limited, United Kingdom, represented by AA Thornton IP LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is ASHIA ZAHRNI, Saudi Arabia.

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

The disputed domain name <ticketsvirginmegastore.online> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 14, 2024. On June 14, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 2024, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 2024, 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 19, 2024.

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 21, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 11, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 17, 2024.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 2024. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is Virgin Enterprises Limited, a United Kingdom company part of the Virgin Group, operating in a diverse range of sectors, among which financial services, health and wellness, music and entertainment, telecommunications and media, travel and leisure, and owning several trademark registrations all over the world for VIRGIN and VIRGIN MEGASTORE, among which:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003092381 for VIRGIN, registered on May 1, 2015;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 1141309 for VIRGIN, registered on May 21, 2012;
- Saudi Arabian Trade Mark Registration No. 767/33 for VIRGIN MEGASTORE, registered on January 7, 2005;
- Saudi Arabian Trade Mark Registration No. 767/34 for VIRGIN MEGASTORE, registered on January 7, 2005.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its main website being "www.virgin.com", and "www.virginmegastore.com" being its website for the Complainant's VIRGIN MEGASTORE stores opened all over the world.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on April 20, 2024, and it is inactive. However, before the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that purportedly sold tickets for an event taking place in Kuwait.

#### **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 its trademarks VIRGIN and VIRGIN MEGASTORE, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark VIRGIN MEGASTORE, with the addition of the term "tickets", concerning the Complainant's business in relation to the retail of tickets for a wide variety of events.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademarks within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolved to a website that purportedly sold tickets for an event taking place in Kuwait.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademarks VIRGIN and VIRGIN MEGASTORE are distinctive and well known. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website in which tickets for an event taking place in Kuwait were purportedly offered for sale, creates the impression of a relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant and disrupts the Complainant's business, qualifying as bad faith registration and use.

Finally, the Complainant suspects that the Respondent might also use the disputed domain name in connection with phishing activities.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **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 3.0](#), 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "tickets", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain, in this case “.online”, is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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 3.0](#), 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 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. On the contrary, the use of the disputed domain name for resolving to a website that purportedly sold tickets for an event taking place in Kuwait, is likely to create confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to the disputed domain name’s source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, including the term “tickets” relevant to the Complainant’s retail of tickets for a wide variety of events, carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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.

In the present case, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks VIRGIN and VIRGIN MEGASTORE is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because the disputed domain name resolved to a website that purportedly sold tickets for an event, that is one of the Complainant’s activities.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith since it was resolving to a website in which the same services as the Complainant were offered, likely in connection with a phishing scheme, creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

As regards the current use of the disputed domain name, directing to an inactive website, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks, the

composition of the disputed domain name, the previous use of the disputed domain name, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a formal response and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which includes the Complainant's trademark VIRGIN MEGASTORE in its entirety with the mere addition of the term "tickets", concerning the Complainant's business in relation to the retail of tickets for a wide variety of events, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, and to attract Internet users to its website in accordance with 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 <ticketsvirginmegastore.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Edoardo Fano/*

**Edoardo Fano**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 29, 2024