

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Shishir Amhed, Kamrul Hasan, Optosoft-IT  
Case No. D2025-0626

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL c/o Walters Law Group, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondents are Shishir Amhed, Bangladesh, Kamrul Hasan, Optosoft-IT, Bangladesh.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain name <megaepersonals.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. The disputed domain names <megapersonalsea.com> and <megapersonalsu.com> are registered with GMO Internet Group, Inc. d/b/a Onamae.com (Name.com, Inc. and GMO Internet Group, Inc. d/b/a Onamae.com are hereby collectively referred to as the "Registrars").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 17, 2025. On February 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 19 and 21, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Redacted for Privacy, Domain Protection Services, Inc. and Whois Privacy Protection Service by onamae.com) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 27, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on March 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Tobias Malte Müller as the sole panelist in this matter on April 4, 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**

It results from the Complainant’s undisputed allegations that it has been operating a website under the domain names <megapersonals.com> and <megapersonals.eu> and for several years in connection with the provision of Internet-based social introduction and dating services.

Furthermore, the evidence before the Panel prove that Complainant is the registered owner of the United States verbal trademark MEGAPERSONALS registered with no. 6432591 on July 27, 2021 for services in class 45.

The disputed domain names have been registered as follows:

- <megaepersonals.com> on December 1, 2024 by Shishir Amhed;
- <megapersonalsea.com> on December 17, 2024 by Shishir Amhed;
- <megapersonalsu.com> on December 5, 2024 by Kamrul Hasan, Optosoft-IT.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, each of the disputed domain names resolved to active log-in websites that appear to be copies of the Complainant’s website including the MEGAPERSONALS trademark at the top of the websites, the same header menus, layout, content, fonts, and logos and purporting to provide the identical Internet-based social introduction or dating services.

On January 15, 2025, the Complainant sent warning letters to the Respondents regarding the disputed domain names <megaepersonals.com> and <megapersonalsu.com>. The Complainant also sent a warning letter regarding the disputed domain name <megaepersonals.com> through the contact form of the Registrar Name.com, Inc., demanding that they stop using and transfer these disputed domain names. The Respondents did not respond to these letters.

Finally, the Respondents were also named as respondents (along with others) in *Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Kamrul Hasan, Optosoft-IT, Shishir Amhed, MD NOYON ALI, MICHEAL FUNSTON, Shivkumar Yadav, Ansh Ansh, HENRIQUE MANUEL, MKH LTD, priceevaw aw, Rifat Islam*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5089](#), in which the Panel ordered the transfer of the domain names in question after confirming that all three elements of the Policy had been satisfied.

## 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- (1) the complaints for the three disputed domain names should be consolidated. The evidence suggests that the Registrants of the disputed domain names are either one and the same person, entity, or network, are somehow connected to each other, and are under common control aimed at intentionally infringing the trademark and harming consumers;
- (2) The disputed domain names are typosquatted versions of the Complainant's <megapersonals.eu> website, which contain additional vowels such as "e", "ea", or "u";
- (3) The Respondents registered and used the disputed domain names not because they refer to or are associated with the Respondents, but to direct users to websites that are designed to look like the Complainant's website to deceive users into providing their log-in credentials to the Respondents. For this reason, it is very probable that an Internet user might be misled into thinking that the web page is related to or even operated by the Complainant. Previous panels have found no rights or legitimate interests where the disputed domain name is a "clone" of the Complainant's site. In addition, the Respondent can claim no legitimate rights to or interests in the disputed domain names, because the website contains a logo that is identical to the Complainant's logo;
- (4) The Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith. In fact, since the domain names consist of the Complainant's trademark with the insertion of additional vowels such as "e", "ea", and "u". Moreover, the Respondents offer not only the same services as the Complainant but have in fact designed the services to look identical to those services offered by the Complainant to further induce consumer confusion. The fact that the Respondents did not respond to the warning letters is further evidence of bad faith. Finally, the Respondents are engaged in a pattern of conduct, because they are serial cybersquatters, see for example, the UDRP cases involving Shishir Amhed: *Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Kamrul Hasan, Optosoft-IT, Shishir Amhed, MD NOYON ALI, MICHEAL FUNSTON, Shivkumar Yadav, Ansh Ansh, HENRIQUE MANUEL, MKH LTD, priceevaw aw, Rifat Islam*; WIPO Case No. [D2024-5089](#), *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Privacy Protection / Shishir Amhed /org Whiteregistrar Inc*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2130](#); and *The Lumineers, LLC v. Ansh Shishir Ahmed, Bing Event*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2678](#); and for Kamrul Hasan, Optosoft-IT: *Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Kamrul Hasan, Optosoft-IT, Shishir Amhed, MD NOYON ALI, MICHEAL FUNSTON, Shivkumar Yadav, Ansh Ansh, HENRIQUE MANUEL, MKH LTD, priceevaw aw, Rifat Islam*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5089](#).

### B. Respondents

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (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.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied. Before doing so, the Panel will address the consolidation.

### **Consolidation: Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

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

As set forth in section 4.11.2 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#): "Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s)."

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following factors:

- (1) The disputed domain names follow the same naming pattern by incorporating the trademark MEGAPERSONALS. In addition, all disputed domain names combine said mark with one or two additional vowels;
- (2) The disputed domain names were registered in December 2024 with privacy services, with two of those domain names registered at the same Registrar. Additionally, the Registrar Verification responses showed that the Respondents are located in the same town of Dhaka, Bangladesh;
- (3) The disputed domain names resolve to active websites that appear to be copies of the Complainant's website including the MEGAPERSONALS trademark at the top of the websites, the same header menus, layout, content, fonts, and logos and purporting to provide the identical Internet-based social introduction or dating services.

On the balance of probabilities and taking into account the above circumstances of the present case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The Respondents have been given the opportunity to comment on the foregoing and have elected not to file a response or to provide any explanation. In particular, the Respondents failed to come forward with any allegations or evidence to object the consolidation.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

#### **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 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 clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. The addition of one or two vowels in the disputed domain names is an obvious or intentional misspelling. The disputed domain names are therefore to be considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 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 illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Finally, the Panel does not dispose of any elements that could lead the Panel to the conclusion that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that it has acquired trademark rights pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

One of these circumstances is that the Respondent by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, it results from the Complainant's documented allegations that each of the disputed domain names resolved to active log-in websites that appear to be copies of the Complainant's website including the MEGAPERSONALS trademark at the top of the websites, the same header menus, layout, content, fonts, and logos and purporting to provide the identical Internet-based social introduction or dating services. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent positively knew of the Complainant's mark and website. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain names included the Complainant's trademark when they registered the disputed domain names.

On this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain names' registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent have registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith:

- (i) the nature of the disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant's mark merely inserting one or two vowels;
- (ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain names direct, displaying the Complainant's trademark, logo, and purportedly offering log-in to the Complainant's services;
- (iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain names;
- (iv) the Respondent failing to reply to the pre-complaint warning letters sent by the Complainant;
- (v) the Respondent being engaged in a pattern of conduct as respondents in the UDRP cases noted above.
- (vi) the Respondents concealing their identity behind privacy services and providing incomplete or false contact details when registering the disputed domain names considering the courier's inability to deliver the Written Notice due to bad address.

Finally, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <megaepersonals.com>, <megapersonalsea.com> and <megapersonalsu.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Tobias Malte Müller/*

**Tobias Malte Müller**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 18, 2025