

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Skyscanner Limited v. Idah Idah

Case No. D2025-0144

1. The Parties

Complainant is Skyscanner Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Lewis Silkin LLP, United Kingdom.

Respondent is Idah Idah, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <skyscannir.com> 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 January 15, 2025. On January 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 17, 2025, 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 Complainant on January 20, 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 January 24, 2025.

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 January 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 16, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on February 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeffrey M. Samuels as the sole panelist in this matter on February 21, 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 Skyscanner Limited provides online advertising services relating to the travel industry.

Complainant owns International Trade Mark Registration No. 1030086, issued on December 1, 2009, for the SKYSCANNER trademark, which registration has been extended into a number of countries, including China, Japan, Mexico, and the Russian Federation. Complainant also owns United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. 2313916, issued on April 30, 2004, and Canadian Trade Mark Registration No. TMA786689, issued on January 10, 2011, for the SKYSCANNER mark.

Complainant also owns the <skyscanner.net> domain name and its website at that domain name attracts tens of millions of unique visits each month. As of August 2023, the “www.skyscanner.net” website has been visited 46.59 million times. To date, the SKYSCANNER smart device application has been downloaded over 70 million times.

The disputed domain name, <skyscannir.com>, was registered on December 27, 2024. Prior to the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name is claimed to resolve to a website that reproduced Complainant’s mark and contained a log-in page. Complainant notes that it did not take screenshots of the disputed domain name’s previous use and that at the time of the filing of the Complaint, it asserts that the disputed domain name appears to have been deactivated. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name redirects to Complainant’s website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to its SKYSCANNER mark, save that it replaces the letter “e” in the SKYSCANNER mark with the letter “i”.

Complainant next asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant indicates that, so far as it is aware, Respondent does not own any registered rights in any trademark that comprises part or all of the disputed domain name. It further contends that the term “skyscannir” is not descriptive and does not have any generic, dictionary meaning. Complainant maintains that it has not given its consent to Respondent to use the SKYSCANNER mark in a domain name registration. While the disputed domain name is claimed to be currently inactive, Complainant declares that “any use of the domain name is likely to take advantage of the Complainant’s Rights for illegitimate gain. Such use cannot constitute a legitimate interest or bona fide, non-commercial use of the Domain Name.”

With respect to the issue of “bad faith” registration and use, Complainant asserts that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s business under the SKYSCANNER mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, in view of the fact that Complainant’s trademark rights date back to 2002, some 22 years prior to registration of the disputed domain name. Complainant notes that its mark enjoyed a great deal of exposure in the international media in November 2016, after Complainant was acquired by China’s largest online travel agency.

According to Complainant, “[t]he overwhelming likelihood is that the Respondent registered the Domain Name to make money from it. The actual way in which it seeks to do so is unclear; it may intend to sell the Domain Name to the Complainant, a competitor or a critic. Alternatively, it may intend to set up a service in direct competition with the Complainant’s, or, as the case is likely here, to pose as the Complainant. Regardless, the Respondent has registered the Domain Name that it cannot use lawfully. That, of itself, amounts to registration and use in bad faith.”

Complainant also submits that Respondent's passive holding constitutes use in bad faith. It points out that in the absence of a Response from Respondent and explanation as to why any use of the disputed domain name could be in good faith, on the balance of probability, Respondent has registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Complainant indicates that it conducted a Reverse Whois search against Respondent's email address which revealed that Respondent registered an array of domain names containing third-party marks that operate in the air travel industry. In *VENTE-PRIVEE.COM, VENTE-PRIVEE.COM IP S.à.r.l. v. Idah Idah / Privacy Administrator*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1053](#), it was held that "[b]ased on the evidence provided...the Respondent own[s] or [is] connected with more than 5,000 registered domain names that reproduce or typosquat various well-known marks...." Complainant asserts that "[t]his clearly demonstrates a pattern of bad faith conduct on the part of the Respondent."

B. Respondent

Respondent did not 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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name constitutes a classic case of typosquatting, substituting the letter "i" for the letter "e." in the mark (skyscannir v. skyscanner). Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given the widespread use of the distinctive SKYSCANNER mark around the world, use that predates the registration of the disputed domain name by over 20 years, the Panel finds that Respondent had Complainant and its trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's website at the time of drafting this Decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8. The disputed domain name constitutes an obvious misspelling of the SKYSCANNER mark and panels normally find that employing a misspelling signals an intention to confuse users seeking Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The available record on file also supports a determination that Respondent is a serial domain name squatter.

The Panel finds that 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 disputed domain name <skyscannir.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey M. Samuels/

Jeffrey M. Samuels

Sole Panelist

Date: March 7, 2025