

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

JD Sports Fashion PLC v. Mira Holdings, Inc.

Case No. D2025-0375

1. The Parties

The Complainant is JD Sports Fashion PLC, United Kingdom, represented internally.

The Respondent is Mira Holdings, Inc. United States of America ("United States"), self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jdsport.com> is registered with SNAPNAMES, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 30, 2025. On January 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 31, 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 (Snapnames 74, LLC, Network Solutions, Newfold Digital) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 3, 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 amendment to the Complaint on the same date.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the original due date for Response was February 24, 2025. Following a request sent by the Respondent on February 9, 2025, from the contact email address provided by the Registrar, under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, the due date for Response was extended to February 28, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on February 28, 2025. In the Response, it was disclosed that the Respondent as listed in Section 1 above should be considered as the Respondent. This differed from the name for the

registrant of the disputed domain name as disclosed by the Registrar (Domain Admin, New Providence, Bahamas).

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink, Marilena Comanescu, and Matthew Kennedy as the Administrative Panel in this matter on April 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a global omnichannel retailer of sports fashion wear and outdoor brands. The Complainant was founded in North West England in 1981. Today, the Complainant operates over 4,500 stores across 36 countries with a strong presence in the United Kingdom, Europe, North America, and Asia Pacific.

The Complainant operates in excess of 1,250 stores under the JD SPORTS brand globally, including the United Kingdom, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, Thailand, and Singapore. In the financial year 2023, the Complainant opened 216 stores under the JD SPORTS brand.

In addition to its physical stores, the Complainant operates e-commerce websites from which products can be ordered. Such websites include, but are not limited to, “www.jdsports.com”, “www.jdsports.co.uk”, “www.global.jdsports.com”, “www.jdsports.ca”, “www.jdsports.fr”, “www.jdsports.be”, “www.jdsports.nl”, and “www.jdsports.es”.

The Complainant has several trademark registrations for the word mark JD SPORTS, including but not limited to European Union trademark registration No. 008182611, with a registration date of December 13, 2011, and United States trademark registration No. 5524042, with a registration date of July 24, 2018, both for a variety of goods and services, including sporting goods.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 16, 2024.

The disputed domain name earlier resolves to a parked page showing pay-per-click (“PPC”) advertising unrelated to the Complainant’s activities and currently resolves to a parked page on which it is shown that the disputed domain name is possibly for sale with a link allowing Internet users to inquire about the disputed domain name.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

The Complainant has established significant reputation and goodwill in the mark JD SPORTS globally including the United Kingdom through its longstanding use of the JD SPORTS mark. The Complainant has millions of followers across its social media pages/channels. The Complainant has provided details of its use of the JD SPORTS mark on its social media channels. As a result, the JD SPORTS name is recognized by the purchasing public as indicating the goods and/or services of its established brand.

The disputed domain name uses the entirety of the Complainant's trademark JD SPORTS and uses the Complainant's registered company name JD SPORTS (JD SPORTS FASHION PLC under company no. 01888425). The omission of the "s" is likely to be a common typographical error by consumers and would therefore lead consumers into thinking that the disputed domain name originates from the Complainant, with its legitimate website at "www.jdsports.com", when that is not the case.

The use of the disputed domain name for a PPC parking page does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the trademark of the Complainant. The Complainant has no business or other relationship with the Respondent. The Complainant has not consented to the registration of the disputed domain name or any use which may be made of it. The Complainant submits that to the best of its knowledge the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

It is without question that the Complainant has a substantial and valuable goodwill in the trademark JD SPORTS as a result of its continuous use since 1981 and its global trading.

The Respondent must be aware of the registered trademarks of the Complainant and of the significant reputation and goodwill established in the JD SPORTS trademark.

The bad faith on the part of the Respondent is evidenced by the consistent and extensive use of the Complainant's JD SPORTS mark over many years in which the Complainant has gained substantial goodwill and reputation in the JD SPORTS trademark. Due to its reputation in the trademark JD SPORTS, under which it operates a chain of retail stores and a network of e-commerce websites in over 30 countries around the world, it is hard to believe that the disputed domain name was registered, or is being used, in good faith, without the Respondent having been aware of the Complainant and its JD SPORTS trademark. JD SPORTS has no independent meaning and is not a natural word or phrase.

It can be inferred that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge, or it should have known, that the disputed domain name was nearly identical with the JD SPORTS trademark. This inference is supported by: (i) the disputed domain name being near identical to the Complainant's trade mark registration for JD SPORTS; (ii) the Complainant's goodwill and reputation in the trademark; and (iii) the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines. The disputed domain name has been registered by the Respondent in a way to confuse consumers into thinking that it is controlled by the Complainant. As the Complainant's legitimate website is "www.jdsports.com" consumers are likely to believe that the Respondent's website is operated by the Complainant.

This demonstrates that the disputed domain name is directed at: (i) disrupting the Complainant's business and/or (ii) intentionally attempting to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source or affiliation of the Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on that website or location.

Further, or in the alternative, the Complainant submits that the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. The disputed domain name is being used in relation to a parking page featuring PPC links from which the Respondent will earn an income. It is implausible that the use of the disputed domain name, which is nearly identical to the trademark JD SPORTS in which the Complainant enjoys a substantial goodwill, was registered in good faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name, in particular that the Complainant has not satisfied the second and third element.

Notably, to the extent relevant for this decision, the Respondent contends the following.

The Respondent is a professional domain name investor with more than 1,000 “generic” domain names under ownership and offered for sale.

The disputed domain name is a valuable “2-Letter abbreviation plus a generic keyword” domain with an estimated value of more than USD 6,100 according to the GoDaddy domain appraisal tool as submitted in evidence. This evidence also shows comparable domain names sold such as <btsport.com> at USD 5,000, <jdsports.com> (the Complainant’s domain name) at USD 10,000, <ndsport.com> at USD 5,000, and <xlsport.com> at USD 8,995. Based on these domain values a decision to purchase the disputed domain name was made by the Respondent in August of 2024 when the disputed domain name became available in a public auction of abandoned domain names. The disputed domain name was expiring on August 16, 2024, so the Respondent chose to participate in the public auction at Snapnames.com. If the Complainant had desired to acquire the disputed domain name, it could have placed a bid to join the public auction at Snapnames.com, or demanded that Snapnames stop the auction and award the Complainant the disputed domain name. It did neither. When the Respondent won the disputed domain name at the auction for USD 799, the price paid was based on the shortness and memorable nature of the disputed domain name.

The term “jdsport” is made up of the “generic strings ‘jd’ and Sport’.” The Respondent owns several domains with a two-letter abbreviation and the “sport” keyword. For example, the Respondent owns <absport.com> and <awsport.com>. The Respondent also owns several domains with the “jd” abbreviation plus a keyword, such as <jdenterprises.com> and <jdent.com>. The Respondent has sold comparable “two-letter abbreviation plus a generic keyword” domain names for considerable sums, such as <dkLaw.com> at USD 25,000, <fcBank.com> at USD 37,500, and <temortgage.com> at USD 7,500. Comparable domain names sold by others would be <rtbet.com> at USD 60,000 and <ezbank.com> at USD 50,000.

Domain names that are currently owned by the Respondent that have been purchased at auction in a similar manner are <ogindustries.com> and <lmhomes.com>. This is consistent with the Respondent’s bona fide business plan of acquiring short memorable domain names to list for sale or lease to the general public, not specifically targeting the Complainant in any way.

A DotDB.com search for “jdsport” lists more than a dozen individuals or companies that are using the “jdsport” name in their chosen domain name. The Respondent has provided examples of this.

Searching the United States Patent and Trademark Office database did not find any live United States trademarks for the “jdsport” name owned by the Complainant.

The disputed domain name has never been used by the Respondent to interfere in any way with the Complainant’s business, nor to target the Complainant. The disputed domain name has been “parked” at Bodis.com since acquisition, with an inquiry page or an inquiry message with ads unrelated to the Complainant. The disputed domain name has never been offered for sale directly to the Complainant. Offering a generic domain name for sale, in itself, is not “bad faith.”

The Complainant knows the value of domain names. Submitted evidence shows that <jdsports.com> was purchased for USD 10,000. A search on NameBio.com shows that the Complainant apparently purchased this domain name from the Sedo.com marketplace in May of 2010 for USD 10,000.

The Complaint is silent about the fact that, for decades, the disputed domain name was registered and used by a company called JDmag.net, as a website that featured “Sports News”, which use was apparently not confusing to consumers. The former registrant of the disputed domain name ceased use of it in 2024, and the Respondent obtained the disputed domain name at a public auction of abandoned domain names, because it is the combination of “an abbreviation and a common word”, forming a commonly used business name.

In the past, the Complainant has purchased domain names for its business, but in this case, it appears that the Complainant did very little due diligence to learn about a fair market price for the disputed domain name.

Instead of consulting an outside domain broker to see if a purchase should be made, the Complainant chose to file a complaint under the Policy to try to get control of the disputed domain name through a legal proceeding rather than purchase the disputed domain name for a fair price as it had done in the past which is often evidence of bad faith and “Reverse Domain Name Hijacking”.

Holding a domain name that is a common name used by multiple companies and individuals is not a bad faith registration. In fact, the Respondent had zero knowledge of the Complainant until the filing of the Complaint. The Respondent is based in Minnesota in the United States, and the Complainant is in the United Kingdom. Panels have found that respondents should not be responsible for searching the world for possible foreign trademarks.

The Complainant also appears to mainly use “jd” rather than “jd sports” in both its website and retail locations. A screen shot of the Complainant's current United States website shows four instances of “jd” rather than “jd sports”. The Complainant's website shows one instance of “JD New Arrivals” and three instances of “Global Access powered by JD” on the front page. There is no mention of “jd sports.” The Complainant has a single store in Minnesota at the Mall of America. A screenshot from the Mall of America website shows a picture of the Complainant's store with two large “jd” logo signs at the entrances to the store. This listing in the Mall of America directory is for “jd” only.

It has been held by many UDRP panels that domain name investors provide a bona fide offering of goods and services. These decisions all show a similar pattern, and this supports a conclusion that the disputed domain name is more likely to have been registered not with the intent to target the Complainant, but rather as part of a legitimate domain name investing business.

It is apparent that the Respondent has registered many other “abbreviation plus keyword” domains, that he did not target the Complainant's trademark, that the Respondent has not offered to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant, and that the Complainant could have acquired the disputed domain name from Snapnames.com, at the auction, but chose not to do so.

The Respondent requests that the Complaint be denied and that the Complainant be found guilty of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

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.

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 mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name only differs from the trademark through the omission of the letter “s” at the end. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In the light of its conclusions under the third element of the Policy, below, the Panel does not consider it necessary or appropriate to reach a determination under the second element in this case.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In order to satisfy the third element under the Policy, the Complainant must establish the conjunctive requirement that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. In order to demonstrate, first, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of its trademark when it registered the disputed domain name, and did so in order to take unfair advantage of the commercial goodwill attaching to that trademark, in other words, “targeting” the Complainant’s trademark rights.

The Complainant has provided some evidence of the notoriety of its mark, but not specifically to various parts of the world. It has in particular not provided evidence of the notoriety of its mark JD SPORTS in the United States, where the Respondent is based. However, it does show that it uses its mark online, including at its websites and social media accounts, and that its Facebook account has 3.9 million followers while its TikTok account has 3 million followers. Based on the evidence before it, the Panel is willing to accept that this mark enjoys notoriety also in the United States. As such it is beyond doubt for the Panel, that the Respondent could have been aware of this mark, when registering the disputed domain name.

Nonetheless, the central question is whether the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its mark JD SPORTS.

The disputed domain name is not identical to the Complainant’s trademark. Although it differs from the mark only in the omission of the plural “s”, the disputed domain name can also be read as two initials followed by the dictionary word “sport”, correctly spelt. The Complainant shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name with a PPC links landing page, but none of the links are related to the Complainant, its competitors, or the types of goods and services that it offers. The Complainant does not allege that the disputed domain name was registered for the purpose of resale at a profit to itself (or its competitor) based on its value as a misspelling of its mark.

The Respondent has in detail explained and substantiated its modus operandi, in general and in relation to the disputed domain name, as described in the Respondent’s contentions (see above under 5.B).

As a result, the Complainant has not met its burden of demonstrating that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark and in order to target that trademark.

While it is strictly unnecessary in view of the conjunctive requirement to consider the Respondent’s use (as opposed to registration) of the disputed domain name, the Panel observes that, for similar reasons as set out above, it finds no evidence or circumstances upon which to infer that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

The Panel finds that, although the Complaint was not successful, there was a reasonable basis for filing the Complaint, also as it was not clear to the Complainant what the background of the Respondent was. The Complaint was therefore not brought in bad faith and thus not as an abuse of the administrative proceeding.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/
Willem J. H. Leppink
Presiding Panelist

/Marilena Comanescu/
Marilena Comanescu
Panelist

/Matthew Kennedy/
Matthew Kennedy
Panelist
Date: April 17, 2025