

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sony Interactive Entertainment LLC v. Domain Admin
Case No. D2024-5098

1. The Parties

Complainant is Sony Interactive Entertainment LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented internally.

Respondent is Domain Admin, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <playstation.blog> 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 December 11, 2024. On December 11, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 11, 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 (Privacy Protection) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 12, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 17, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 17, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 6, 2025.

Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 17, 2024, to which Complainant replied on December 18, 2024. Based on these communications, the Center suspended the proceedings for 30 days on December 19, 2024, and extended suspension for another 30 days on January 24, 2025. The proceedings were reinstituted on February 24, 2025. The due date for Response was March 14, 2025.

Respondent did not file a formal Response. The Center notified the Parties of the commencement of the panel appointment process on March 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on March 20, 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

Complainant (together with its organizational affiliates, "Complainant") is a global provider of electronics and entertainment goods and services. Since 1994, Complainant has offered gaming consoles under the mark PLAYSTATION. Complainant is the owner of several registrations for its PLAYSTATION mark. These include, among others, United States Registration No. 4430716 (registered November 12, 2013).

The disputed domain name was registered on January 25, 2024. The website associated with the disputed domain name contains links to third-party websites that offer goods and services that compete with those offered by Complainant under its PLAYSTATION mark. Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, nor any license to use Complainant's marks.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the PLAYSTATION mark which is "incredibly well known on a global scale" in connection with the "hundreds of millions" of PLAYSTATION gaming consoles sold by Complainant over the past three decades. Complainant also asserts that it owns the registration for the domain name <playstation.com> which Complainant has used to communicate with consumers online "since as early as 1997."

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, having likely acquired the disputed domain name for Respondent's own commercial gain.

B. Respondent

On the same day the proceedings were commenced, Respondent sent an informal communication stating, "We offer unilateral consent to transfer. Please give the complainant the domain name [...]" Respondent did not complete a settlement agreement however, and did not substantively reply to 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. Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, PLAYSTATION, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO](#)

[Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

Complainant has submitted evidence that the website associated with the disputed domain name provides links to third-party websites offering competing goods and services to those offered by Complainant under its PLAYSTATION mark. In circumstances where Respondent has not sought to claim, let alone establish, that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a well-known trademark owned by Complainant. The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s Decision, the record includes evidence that the website associated with disputed domain name contains links to third-party websites that offer goods and services that compete with those offered by Complainant under its PLAYSTATION mark.

On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that Respondent is trading on the goodwill of Complainant’s trademarks to attract Internet users, presumably for Respondent’s own commercial gain.

Therefore, the Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <playstation.blog> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2025