

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Travellers Exchange Corporation Limited v. Salma Asli
Case No. D2025-0197

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Travellers Exchange Corporation Limited, United Kingdom (“UK”), represented by Deloitte LLP, UK.

The Respondent is Salma Asli, United Arab Emirates (“UAE”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <travelex-uae.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 17, 2025. On January 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 21, 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 (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 22, 2025, 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 January 23, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz 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

The Complainant and its group of companies operate a foreign exchange business, which is active across 60 countries and covers the entire value chain of the retail foreign exchange industry. In its retail business, the Complainant operates over 1,000 stores in international airports, major transport hubs, premium shopping malls, high street locations, supermarkets, and city centers. Additionally, the Complainant has developed a network of over 900 ATMs at both on-airport and off-airport locations around the world together with an online and mobile foreign exchange platform. In 2023, the Complainant generated 534.2 million GBP in revenue (Annex 8 of the Complaint).

The Complainant owns, amongst others, the following trademarks (Annex 4 of the Complaint):

- UAE trademark registration no. 8851 TRAVELEX (word), registered on February 25, 1997, for services in class 36;
- European Union ("EU") trademark registration no. 018130041 TRAVELEX (word), registered on January 31, 2021 for services in classes 35, 38 and 42; and
- UK trademark registration no. UK00003429410 TRAVELEX (logo) registered on March 20, 2020 for goods and services in classes 09, 35, 36, 38 and 42.

The Complainant has brought forward lists of trademark registrations of TRAVELEX, that show further registrations around the world (Annex 4 of the Complaint). The Complainant operates its main website at "www.travelex.com". Other websites of the Complainant include "www.travelex-corporate.com" and "www.travelexae.com".

The disputed domain name is <travelex-uae.com>. It was registered on September 11, 2024. The disputed domain name is inactive and resolves to a "Launching Soon" page (Annex 12 of the Complaint).

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.

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark TRAVELEX, with only the addition of "-uae" at the end. The Complainant states, that the mark TRAVELEX is clearly identical visually, aurally, and conceptually within the disputed domain name. In its view, the mark is distinctive. The combination of "ex" with the word "travel" results in a distinctive word and sound, that reflects the Complainant's corporate name (Travellers Exchange Corporation) and has conceptual links to "exchange" of currency for travel purposes. The Complainant states, that the term "uae" refers to the territory of the United Arab Emirates, indicating that the disputed domain name is targeted at individuals in that country while the Complainant is also very well known in that area and operates a website under the domain name <travelexae.com>. Therefore, in its view, the inclusion of "uae" does not serve to distinguish the disputed domain name from the mark at a conceptual level. Moreover, the Complainant states, that the disputed domain name reflects the structure of the Complainant's domain names, which are typically

structured consisting of the mark TRAVELEX, followed by a certain appendix. The Complainant claims, that the generic Top-Level Domain “.com” should be ignored.

On the second element, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that it has never given any license to any third party in that area to use the trademark TRAVELEX. To the Complainant’s knowledge, no third party, let alone the Respondent, has sought or attempted to seek any authorization from the Complainant to use the mark as part of the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that there is no visible business activity under the disputed domain name. Further the Complainant argues that the website is inactive and resolves to a holding page (Annex 12 of the Complaint). It claims that the passive holding of the website does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or to legitimate noncommercial fair use. The Complainant claims that according to its research there are no signs of a planned activity by the Respondent either.

On the third element, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name should be considered as having been registered in bad faith by the Respondent. As to registration in bad faith, the Complainant claims that its “TRAVELEX” trademarks are widely known and that the Complainant has established rights in these trademarks well before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has invested in the reputation of the mark and that the mark is referenced in various media (Annex 7 of the Complaint). The Complainant states it has been recognized for the quality of its products and services and has received awards and nominations (Annex 7 of the Complaint). It points to extended presence in social media as well as newspapers and magazines (Annex 7 of the Complaint). The Complainant refers to earlier UDRP decisions according to which TRAVELEX was considered well-known internationally by previous panels (*Travellers Exchange Corporation Limited v. Sandy Dreben*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1333](#); *Travellers Exchange Corporation Limited v. WhoisGuard, Inc/ Lord Oxford*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2231](#)). Thus, according to the Complainant, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name. Therefore, the registration had to be made in bad faith. As to use in bad faith the Complainant finds that even if the disputed domain name resolves to a holding page, this will nevertheless cause confusion among consumers.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant must demonstrate that the three elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied. These 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; 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 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. In particular, it has shown rights in the mark TRAVELEX.

The Panel finds the mark is reproduced in its entirety 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 “-uae”) may bear on the 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.

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.

Having reviewed the available 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.

There are no demonstrable rights or legitimate interests of the disputed domain name in favor of the Respondent, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. The demonstrated use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a “Launching Soon” page does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods and services in the circumstances of this case. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Panel fails to recognize any legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name composed of the identical trademark of the Complainant and adding a hyphen and the letters “uae”. The disputed domain name resolves to a holding page.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1. Considering the available record and in particular the nature and composition of the disputed domain name, including the clear absence of legitimate rights coupled with no credible explanation of the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As to use in bad faith, 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 reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel 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.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the 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 <travelex-uae.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: March 7, 2025