

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Trapstar Collective Limited dba Trapstar v. Mubashir Jamil, JDBA8065 Ar Rabwah District and Trap Star Comapny, 8466, Wahab Bin Khuleed, 4278  
Case No. D2025-0679

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Trapstar Collective Limited dba Trapstar, United Kingdom, represented by Corsearch, United States of America.

The Respondents are Mubashir Jamil, JDBA8065 Ar Rabwah District and Trap Star Comapny, 8466, Wahab Bin Khuleed, 4278, Saudi Arabia.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <trap-star.com> and <trap-star-italy.com> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 19, 2025. On February 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 20, 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 FOR PRIVACY / Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0172441784) 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 Registrar, 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 March 1, 2025. Upon request of the Complaint, three domain names were withdrawn from the Complaint, with the two disputed domain names remaining.

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 March 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 10, 2025. The Respondent, Mubashir Jamil, sent email communications to the Center on several occasions in February and March 2025.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on May 5, 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 a London-based streetwear brand that sells clothing, sneakers, and accessories.

The Complainant owns various TRAPSTAR trademarks, including International Trademark No. 1778807 registered on September 28, 2023.

The disputed domain names were registered on June 23, 2024 (<trap-star.com>) and October 4, 2024 (<trap-star-italy.com>) and direct to websites purportedly offering products of the Complainant.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent Mubashir Jamil submitted several informal communications primarily contending that the Respondent had requested to join the affiliate program or otherwise collaborate with Trapstar London, that the use of the disputed domain name <trap-star.com> was intended to demonstrate "potential for ranking and organic traffic", and that the Respondent has not created "any accounts for payment or engaged in any illicit activities on the site".

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **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 Respondent Mubashir Jamil requested removal of the three disputed domain names withdrawn from the dispute and confirmed to be the registrant of the disputed domain name <trap-star.com>, but did not specifically comment on the disputed domain name <trap-star-italy.com>.

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 regards common control, the Panel notes that both dispute domain names share the same registrant contact email address and phone number, were registered with the same Registrar, and share similar domain name composition and websites. In these circumstances, the disputed domain names are clearly 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.

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 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 Complainant's trademark TRAPSTAR is reproduced within the disputed domain names. 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 characters and terms (here a hyphen in "trap-star" and the addition of "-italy") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 that 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 that 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. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademark, coupled with the use of the disputed domain names to purportedly offer products of the Complainant, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent's alleged goal to become an affiliate of the Complainant is insufficient to establish rights or legitimate interests under the Policy in these circumstances, and rather suggests knowledge of the Complainant and an attempt to use the Complainant's trademark without authorization for the Respondent's own commercial benefit.

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

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Under the circumstances of this case, including the composition and use of the disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant's mark with a hyphen between "trap" and "star" and the addition of "-italy"), it can be inferred that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark when registering the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, 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.

Having reviewed the available record, and noting the composition of the disputed domain names, under the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's websites (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <trap-star.com> and <trap-star-italy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Tobias Zuberbühler/*

**Tobias Zuberbühler**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 19, 2025