

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bumble Holding Limited v. Zack Taylor
Case No. D2025-0308

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bumble Holding Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Zack Taylor, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <bumblecricket.com>, <bumberich.com>, <bumble4.com>, <bumble5.com>, <bumble7.com>, and <bumble9.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 25, 2025. On January 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 27, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 28, 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 a first amended Complaint on February 1, 2025.

On February 1, 2025, the Complainant requested that the disputed domain names <bumblecricket.com>, and <bumberich.com>, be added to the proceeding. On February 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names <bumblecricket.com>, and <bumberich.com>. On February 6, 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 (Withheld for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 12, 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 the second amended Complaint on February 17, 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 February 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on March 17, 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 the company behind Bumble, a social networking and dating app. In the year 2014, Bumble launched the Bumble app that enables access to its social networking platform, which facilitates connections for dating, friendship, and professional networking. Bumble now has had over 100 million users worldwide. In February 2021, Bumble went public on the NASDAQ under the ticker symbol BMBL.

The Complainant has used the BUMBLE mark for over a decade in connection with a range of mobile applications and online social platforms, as well as range of products that include such items as clothing, foods and beverages, games, and other merchandise and accessories. In addition to its apps and online community, Bumble distributes and sells an array of clothing, merchandise, and accessories under the BUMBLE mark through its online Bumble Shop (“www.bumble.shop”) and third-party collaborations. Bumble also uses its BUMBLE mark in connection with its various online and in-person social, dating, professional, cultural, educational, and networking events.

The Complainant owns multiple registered United Kingdom trademarks incorporating the term “bumble”. These include, among others, United Kingdom Registration No. UK00909121039, registered on November 2, 2010, covering Classes 29, 30, 32, and 35; United Kingdom Registration No. UK00003072396, registered on January 16, 2015, covering Classes 9, 38, 42, and 45; and United Kingdom Registration No. UK00913335237, registered on February 23, 2015, covering Classes 9, 25, 35, 38, 41, 42, and 45.

The Complainant operates several domain names, including <bumble.com>, registered since 1997, and <bumble.shop>, registered since February 2019.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <bumblecricket.com> on October 15, 2024, <bumblerich.com> on January 15, 2025, <bumble4.com> on October 23, 2024, <bumble5.com> on November 15, 2024, <bumble7.com> on November 27, 2024, and <bumble9.com> on December 17, 2024.

The disputed domain names resolve to a website located at “buzzbread.com” that contains the following message “Get \$100 Free Just for Signing Up—Then Earn Unlimited Commissions! Quick and easy sign-up, no credit card needed. Start earning in less than a minute!”. According to the Complaint, the websites at the disputed domain names are used for a fraud scheme.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to their trademarks. Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant claims the websites at the disputed domain names purported to offer a service where unsuspecting users could make money by performing online tasks such as rating products, watching videos, and referring other users to the disputed domain names in exchange for supposed small payments. The Respondent then offered unsuspecting customers "high-value tasks" with payouts supposedly worth hundreds of dollars that could only be unlocked if users paid a fee. The Complainant contends it has received numerous emails from confused consumers requesting these payments.

Finally, it is argued that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which a complainant must satisfy in order to succeed. The Complainants must satisfy that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (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 BUMBLE mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. 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 like "cricket", "rich" or numbers like "4", "5", "7" or "9" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as fraud scheme mentioned above can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Complainant has used the BUMBLE mark for over a decade in connection with a range of mobile applications and online social platforms.
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain names between the end of 2024 and the beginning of 2025.
- the disputed domain names resolve to a website used for a scam.
- Respondent used a proxy service to conceal its identity.

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.

The Panel finds that the registration and use of the confusingly similar disputed domain names to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant’s trademarks, without authorization, attracts Internet users, for the Respondent’s financial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks.

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 names <bumblecricket.com>, <bumberich.com>, <bumble4.com>, <bumble5.com>, <bumble7.com>, and <bumble9.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: March 31, 2025