

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Ahmed Ali, Petr Pavlovskii, Joseph Lewis,
Ecommerce Company, Daniyal Sheikh, plumbing Jack
Case No. D2024-5104

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., United States of America ("United States") represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Ahmed Ali, Petr Pavlovskii, Joseph Lewis, Ecommerce Company, Daniyal Sheikh, plumbing Jack, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <premiumwikieditors.com>, <thewikieditors.co>, <thewikieditors.com>, <thewikipublishers.com>, <wikiconsultants.com>, <wikipediausers.com>, and <wpediaconsultants.com> are registered with Name Cheap; Hostinger Operations, UAB; and Dominet (HK) Limited (formerly Alibaba.com Singapore E-Commerce Private Limited) (collectively, the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 11, 2024, regarding ten disputed domain names. On the same day, the Center transmitted a request for registrar verification via email to the Registrars concerning the disputed domain names. On December 11 and 12, 2024, the Registrars emailed their verification response to the Center, revealing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondents (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY/PRIVACY SERVICE PROVIDERS) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email to the Complainant on December 13, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information of several underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars. This email requested the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or, alternatively, to demonstrate that the underlying registrants are the same entity and/or that all domain names fall under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 18, 2024, naming seven disputed domains after reaching a settlement with one disputed domain owner and not proceeding against two other disputed domain names.

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 February 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 23, 2025.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on March 3, 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 has numerous operations including (i) Wikipedia, a renowned free online encyclopedia compiled, edited, and maintained by over 115,000 active contributors; (ii) Wikimedia Commons, a shared media repository containing over 100 million freely usable images, sound files, and video files; and (iii) Wikinews, a source for free content news. The Complainant provides technological, legal, fundraising, and administrative support for these projects, which together represent one of the most visited web properties in the world.

The Complainant also supports the Wikimedia movement by managing a network of organizations worldwide, including Wikimedia chapters, thematic organizations, and user groups. These organizations, which share the Complainant’s mission, promote Wikimedia movement activities within defined geographical regions by collecting donations, organizing local events, and advancing current Wikimedia projects such as Wikipedia. Presently, there are 38 chapters, over 146 user groups, and two thematic organizations across 38 countries and six continents.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for the trademarks WIKIPEDIA and WIKINEWS in one hundred eleven jurisdictions worldwide, including:

- United States Registration No. 3040722 for WIKIPEDIA, registered on January 10, 2006;
- United States Registration No. 3505429 for WIKIPEDIA, registered on September 23, 2008;
- United States Registration No. 4710546 for WIKIPEDIA, registered on March 31, 2015;
- International Trademark Registration No. 839132 for WIKIPEDIA, registered on December 16, 2004;
- International Trademark Registration No. 907474 for WIKIPEDIA, registered on September 20, 2006;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1239634 for WIKIPEDIA, registered on June 30, 2014;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 012847836 for WIKIPEDIA, registered on December 4, 2014.
- United States Registration No. 3087280 for WIKINEWS, registered on May 2, 2006.

The Complainant’s WIKIPEDIA and WIKINEWS trademarks will be collectively referred to herein as the “Marks.”

The Complainant registered the domain name <wikipedia.org> on January 13, 2001. The Complainant also owns registrations for many domain names that include the Marks, such as <wikipediya.org>, <wikipediaarticle.org>, and <wikiartpedia.org>.

- the disputed domain name <premiumwikieditors.com> was registered on February 2, 2023;
- the disputed domain name <thewikieditors.co> was registered on March 23, 2024;
- the disputed domain name <thewikieditors.com> was registered on September 11, 2023
- the disputed domain name <thewikipublishers.com> was registered on March 27, 2024;
- the disputed domain name <wikiconsultants.com> was registered on April 25, 2020;

- the disputed domain name <wikipediausers.com> was registered on September 13, 2024; and
- the disputed domain name <wpediaconsultants.com> was registered on October 28, 2024.

The disputed domain names are inactive, except for <wikiconsultants.com>, <premiumwikieditors.com>, and <wpediaconsultants.com>. The disputed domain <wikiconsultants.com> resolves to a website showcasing numerous references to WIKIPEDIA, claiming that it is “helping you,” “being important,” and creating a “strong page.” The disputed domain <premiumwikieditors.com> leads to a site promoting “Premium Wikipedia Page Services in the USA!” The disputed domain <wpediaconsultants.com> directs users to webpages that offer editing services and links to social media sites that promote its offerings. The social media platform “Bark” describes the site as “your premier destination for all your Wikipedia concerns.” A second promotional site has removed information about <wpediaconsultants.com> due to suspected fraudulent reviews. Additionally, the links on <wpediaconsultants.com> that lead to Facebook, LinkedIn, and a third advertising site are broken. The disputed domain <wikipediausers> is a parked domain that was used to create a deceptive email that appeared to be from the Complainant. The remaining inactive disputed domain names previously pointed to websites offering WIKIPEDIA editing services and often had a similar look and feel. Annex 8; see also the Internet Archive Wayback Machine.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transferring the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its Marks because they prominently include the term “wiki” or “wpedia” which are common abbreviations of the Marks and combine the abbreviations with generic terms.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain names are under common control of a single entity or were registered by a single entity using various alter egos or identities.

The Complainant claims that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests regarding the disputed domain names, as the Complainant did not authorize the Respondents to register them or use the Marks or the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not commonly recognized by the disputed domain names, nor is it making a bona fide offer of goods or services or engaging in legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Complainant notes that many of the disputed domain names led to websites that replicated the Complainant's trademark and logo, misleadingly portraying themselves as the Complainant's official website. The Complainant also contends that a disputed domain names may have been used by a Respondent to send emails to third parties, potentially conducting fraudulent phishing activities by impersonating the Complainant and soliciting personal information.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, targeting the Complainant's well-known Marks to form them. The Complainant also contends that the use of the disputed domain names to conduct fraudulent phishing activities and attract Internet users to the Respondent's websites for commercial gain creates a likelihood of confusion regarding the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondents' websites.

B. Respondent

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents and Disputed Domain Names

The amended Complaint was filed against nominally different domain name Registrants. The Complainant alleges that these domain name registrants are the same entity, mere alter egos of one another, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name Registrants in accordance with paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are under common control, and (ii) whether the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties, as outlined in the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

Regarding common control, the Panel observes that all the disputed domain names follow a similar naming pattern and that <premiumwikieditors.com>, <thewikieditors.co>, <thewikieditors.com>, <thewikipublishers.com>, <wikiconsultants.com>, <wikipediausers.com>, and <wpediaconsultants.com> are engaged in a similar commercial activity aimed at impersonating the Complainant through use of the Complainant's Marks and in one case impersonating an employee of Complainant. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names were registered within a year, that many of the registrants have been involved in prior WIPO domain name disputes regarding the Marks, and that all but one of the websites are hosted by Cloudflare. Finally, the Panel observes that the registrants of the disputed domain names did not rebut any of the Complainant's statements or contest the Complainant's consolidation request. The Panel finds that the varying Respondents and differing disputed domain names are part of a common plan and operation controlled by a single source.

Regarding fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidating would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel consolidates the claims involving the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding. Given the above findings, the Respondents will be collectively referred to herein as the "Respondent."

Substantive Issues:

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

1. (i) The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant holds rights;
2. (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
3. (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

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 Marks are recognizable within each disputed domain names. Each of the disputed domain names prominently incorporate the phrases “wiki,” “pedia” or “wpedia” “wiki”, which are a distinctive element of the Marks and a common abbreviation of the Marks. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here “premium”, “editors”, “publishers”, “consultants”, and “users” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8; *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Joseph Lewis, Ecommerce Company; Kevin Lesnar, Infinity Project Manager; Soft Fellow*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2343](#); *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Ahmed Ali, Mercury Digital; Mercury Digital; Joseph Lewis, Ecommerce Company; Andrew Ellis, WikiMakers; Muhammad Ali Khalid; Muhammad Ali Khalid, WikiExperts*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5078](#).

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.

After reviewing the available record, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established a prima facie case showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not provided any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, as specified in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent’s websites lack a clear and adequately prominent disclaimer or statement indicating that they are not affiliated with the Complainant. Several of the Respondent’s websites prominently display the Complainant’s puzzle globe logo (see Annex 8 along with Annex 6) and make numerous references to the WIKIPEDIA mark. Internet visitors are likely to assume that the disputed domain names are associated with, affiliated with, or sponsored by the Complainant. *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Wiki Proficiency*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4068](#).

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) establishes circumstances that, if determined by the Panel to be present, shall serve as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Panel determines that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s Marks and deliberately registered the confusingly similar disputed domain names to attract Internet visitors to the Respondent’s websites for commercial gain by misleading Internet visitors into believing they were visiting a site

sponsored, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant. The Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered with the intent to exploit the Complainant's Marks. The Respondent's active websites offer services directly related to creating content for Wikipedia pages.

While such editing and creation services are not inherently impermissible, the Respondent cannot promote its services using the confusingly similar disputed domain names that resolve to websites with content implying that the Respondent's websites are endorsed, sponsored by, or affiliated with the Complainant or using an email address associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate an employee of the Complainant.

The disputed domain names that direct to inactive pages do not inhibit a determination of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding, as outlined in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

After reviewing the record, the Panel observes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the structure of the disputed domain names, the prior use of those domain names, the implausibility of a good faith use in the case circumstances, and the Respondent's failure to provide a response. The Panel concludes that, in the context of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that using a domain name for passing off, constitutes bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4). Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <premiumwikieditors.com>, <thewikieditors.co>, <thewikieditors.com>, <thewikipublishers.com>, <wikiconsultants.com>, <wikipediausers.com>, and <wpediaconsultants.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: March 25, 2025