

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Woodlaine Digital Solutions Ltd v. Domain Administrator,  
Sugarcane Internet Nigeria Limited  
Case No. D2024-4818

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Woodlaine Digital Solutions Ltd c/o Silverstein Legal, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, Sugarcane Internet Nigeria Limited, Nigeria.

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

The disputed domain name <adulttwork.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 21, 2024. On November 22, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 23, 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 (Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 25, 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 amendment to the Complaint on November 25, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 November 26, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 16, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 17, 2024.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on January 2, 2025. 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 registered in Cyprus. It operates a website at “www.adultwork.com”, comprising an online directory and advertising space for businesses offering adult entertainment services, including webcam models and adult videos.

The Complainant is the owner of European Union trademark registration number 018982471 for the word mark ADULTWORK, registered on June 21, 2024, in International Classes 35, 38 and 41. It is also the owner of United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00004013611 for ADULTWORK, registered on May 3, 2024, in International Classes 35, 38 and 41 and applied for a similar United States registration on February 21, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 21, 2024.

The disputed domain name has resolved to a webpage promoting an adult entertainment website at “www.jerkmate.com”.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant submits that it has made extensive use of the ADULTWORK mark since at least February 19, 2000, being the date of registration of its <adultwork.com> domain name. It claims therefore to have obtained substantial common law rights in that trademark, on an international basis, even before acquiring its trademark registrations.

The Complainant points out that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on the same date the Complainant applied for its United States trademark registration, namely February 21, 2024.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ADULTWORK trademark. It states that the disputed domain name is identical to that trademark, but for the addition of a second letter “t”.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has never authorized it to use its ADULTWORK trademark, that the Respondent has not commonly been known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not making any bona fide commercial use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that, instead, the Respondent is “typosquatting” with a view to taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark rights.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. It asserts that the clear “typosquatting” of the disputed domain name upon its ADULTWORK trademark is in itself evidence of bad faith. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name misleadingly to divert Internet users to its own webpage, where it promotes adult entertainment services that compete directly with those of the Complainant.

The Complainant also provides evidence of “cease and desist” correspondence sent to the Respondent in October 2024, to which it states the Respondent made no reply.

The Complainant request the transfer of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(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**

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark ADULTWORK. The disputed domain name is identical to that trademark, but for the insertion of a second letter “t”, which does not prevent the Complainant’s trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

In the view of the Panel, the Complainant’s submissions set out above give rise to a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has failed to file a Response in this proceeding and has not submitted any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name, or evidence of rights or legitimate interests on its part in the disputed domain name, whether in the circumstances contemplated by paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise. Moreover, the Panel accepts the Complainant’s submission that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for the purpose of “typosquatting” upon the Complainant’s trademark rights.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds the Complainant’s ADULTWORK trademark (and website at “www.adultwork.com”) to be distinctive of the Complainant’s services within the adult entertainment sector. The disputed domain name replicates the Complainant’s URL with the addition only of a second “t” in “adulttwork”. The Respondent having provided no explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel infers that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of the Complainant’s nascent trademark rights and domain name and with the intention of “typosquatting” upon the Complainant’s nascent trademark rights.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name, which is virtually identical to the Complainant's trademark and URL, for the purpose of promoting adult entertainment services which compete with those of the Complainant. The Panel infers that the Respondent receives payment for such promotion, and finds therefore that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

## **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 <adulttwork.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Steven A. Maier/*

**Steven A. Maier**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 9, 2025