

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Waqar Ahmed, and Joseph lewis, Ecommerce Company

Case No. D2025-1149

1. The Parties

Complainant is Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

Respondents are Waqar Ahmed, Pakistan and Joseph lewis, Ecommerce Company, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names are <wikiexpertinc.org>, registered with Dynadot Inc., and <wikiexpertsinc.com>, registered with Dominet (HK) Limited. Collectively, Dynadot and Dominet are referred to as the “Registrars.” The disputed domain names are referred to as the “Domain Names.”

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 20, 2025. On March 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On March 23 and March 24, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names, which differed from the named Respondents and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 27, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaints for the 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. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 1, 2025. Further, following a settlement on April 14, 2025, concerning three of the original five disputed domain names listed in the Complaint, Complainant filed a further amended Complaint on April 29, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2025. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on May 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Christopher S. Gibson as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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

Complainant is a nonprofit charitable organization dedicated to encouraging the growth, development, and distribution of free, multilingual, educational content. Complainant was founded in 2003, and today manages free knowledge projects built and maintained by a community of thousands of active volunteers, known as the "Wikimedia movement." Many well-known projects are managed by Complainant including Wikipedia, a free, online encyclopedia compiled, edited, and maintained by over 115,000 active contributors; Wikimedia Commons, a shared media repository of over 100 million freely usable images, sound files, and video files; and Wikinews, a free-content news source. Complainant provides technological, legal, fundraising, and administrative support for these projects, which together represent one of the most-visited web properties in the world. Complainant also supports the Wikimedia movement by overseeing a network of organizations around the world, including Wikimedia chapters, thematic organizations, and user groups. These organizations, which share Complainant's mission, support Wikimedia activities within a specified geographical region by collecting donations, organizing local events, and promoting current Wikimedia projects such as Wikipedia. Currently, there are thirty-eight chapters, over 146 user groups, and two thematic organizations that span over thirty-eight countries and six continents.

On January 10, 2006, Complainant obtained a registration for the trademark, WIKIPEDIA, registration No. 3,040,722, from the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"), for "[p]roviding information in the field of general encyclopedic knowledge via the Internet." The registration indicates first use of the mark in January 2001. In subsequent years, Complainant has registered numerous other marks that incorporate the WIKIPEDIA mark. Complainant has also secured registrations for similar terms, such as WIKINEWS (United States Registration No. 3,087,280, registered on May 2, 2006.).

Including the above, Complainant owns approximately 468 trademark registrations worldwide for the WIKIPEDIA trademark and foreign equivalents, has extensive common law rights, and has acquired distinctiveness in the WIKIPEDIA mark since its first use in 2001. Complainant owns national and international registrations for its marks in over 111 jurisdictions around the world.

Complainant states its WIKIPEDIA marks are unique and proprietary to Complainant and represent the distinctive nature and quality of services that Complainant provides. Accordingly, the marks have become valuable assets. Even though Complainant is a nonprofit organization, thousands of contributors and volunteers have spent considerable time and effort researching and developing the reference services that are promoted under the WIKIPEDIA marks, both in the United States and throughout the world. Concerning the term "wiki," it is often associated with Complainant.

Complainant registered the domain name <wikipedia.org> on January 13, 2001. Complainant also owns registrations for multiple domain names that incorporate the WIKIPEDIA marks, including <wikipediya.org>, <wikipediaarticle.org>, and <wikiartpedia.org>. Complainant has registered numerous other domain name variants as well.

The Domain Name <wikiexpertinc.org> was registered on August 12, 2024. Complainant states that previously it redirected to Complainant's website but has also provided evidence that it resolves to a blank

page. The Domain Name <wikiexpertsinc.com> was registered on March 27, 2020, and resolves to a webpage purporting to provide a Wikipedia page editing and creation service.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

(i) Identical or confusingly similar

Complainant states that the WIKIPEDIA marks are extremely well known in the United States and throughout the world such that when consumers see the Domain Names, they will likely assume the associated website will direct them to one of Complainant's sites and the goods and services that Complainant provides. See, e.g., *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Salamuddin Shaikh*, WIPO Case No, D2020-1456 (finding Complainant's WIKIPEDIA trademark is "extremely well known" and referencing other UDRP decisions making the same finding); *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Domain Administrator, PrivacyGurdian.org / John Ray*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0010](#) ("Complainant has demonstrated that it has registered and common law rights in the WIKIPEDIA Marks and that the WIKIPEDIA trademark is well known worldwide."); *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0009](#) (noting "that the WIKIPEDIA mark is inherently distinctive for it entails the original juxtaposition of words with different genealogy.").

Complainant submits that the use of "wiki" in the Domain Names is enough to establish confusing similarity with Complainant's WIKIPEDIA marks. Further, the addition of the generic terms "expert," "experts," and "inc," to part of the WIKIPEDIA mark ("wiki"), increases rather than reduces potential risk of confusion. Complainant claims Respondents' use of the term "wiki" has the objective to reference the WIKIPEDIA mark. Complainant also states that previous UDRP panels have confirmed that the use of "wiki" is considered confusingly similar to the WIKIPEDIA mark. See e.g. *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Joseph lewis, Ecommerce Company; Kevin Lesnar, Infinity Project Manager; Soft Fellow*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2343](#) ("The Panel finds the entirety of the mark WIKIPEDIA is reproduced within one of the disputed domain names, while within the other disputed domain names the term "wiki", being a distinctive element and the common abbreviation of the Complainant's trademark WIKIPEDIA, is reproduced. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.... Moreover, as regards the disputed domain names incorporating the term "wiki," the Panel notes the use of the disputed domain names indicates an intent to target the Complainant and its WIKIPEDIA mark, and affirms the finding of confusing similarity.")

In conclusion, Complainant contends the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's WIKIPEDIA and WIKINEWS marks.

(ii) Rights or legitimate interests

Complainant contends Respondents have no rights or legitimate interest in the Domain Names or the WIKIPEDIA trademarks or logo. Respondents are not licensees of or otherwise affiliated with Complainant, and Complainant has never authorized Respondents' registration of the Domain Names. Complainant asserts this alone is sufficient to find that Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Respondents are, to Complainant's knowledge, not commonly known by the Domain Names, nor is there evidence to suggest Respondents are or have been commonly known by "Wikipedia" or any variation of that term. Moreover, Complainant contends Respondents have not made any preparations to use the Domain Names or a name corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor have Respondents used the Domain Names for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use purpose.

The website connected to the Domain Name <wikiexpertsinc.com> purports to reference an active undisclosed paid editing (“UPE”) site, which does not fulfill the test put forward in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), in connection with any allegation that Respondents are service providers in relation to Complainant’s products and services and are making a bona fide offering of goods or services. Complainant argues that Respondents’ non-existing relationship with Complainant is not made clear – the site connected to <wikiexpertsinc.com> contains Complainant’s puzzle globe logo. Furthermore, it does not include any clear and sufficiently prominent disclaimer clarifying that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant. While there is a small disclaimer buried at the bottom of the website, Complainant states it is highly unlikely that this would be noticed by any visitors. It is more likely that they will notice the repeated use of Complainant’s logotype and trademarks, which are prominently used throughout the website.

Complainant states the Domain Name <wikiexpertinc.org> merely redirects to Complainant’s own official website, which does not give rise to a legitimate interest in it. Under these circumstances, Complainant states it has made a *prima facie* showing that Respondents do not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

(iii) Registered and used in bad faith

Complainant contends Respondents reserved, used, and are holding the Domain Names willfully, in bad faith, and in disregard of Complainant’s exclusive rights to use and authorize the use of the WIKIPEDIA mark.

As an initial matter, Complainant contends Respondents did not adopt the Domain Names in ignorance of Complainant’s WIKIPEDIA mark. Rather, the evidence suggests they were well acquainted with Complainant’s mark when registering the Domain Names in 2020 (<wikiexpertsinc.com>) and 2024 (<wikiexpertinc.org>). Respondents’ service aims to provide “professional Wikipedia services.” Such knowledge is sufficient to establish that the Domain Names were appropriated by Respondents in bad faith.

Further, Complainant asserts that by using the Domain Names, Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s well-known mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondents’ websites, or of a product or service on Respondents’ websites or location. There have been numerous cases in which Panels have found such use to amount to bad faith, see e.g., *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Wiki Proficiency*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4068](#), where the panel held:

“In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The disputed domain names were registered approximately 15 years after the Complainant registered its WIKIPEDIA mark. While the composition of the disputed domain names reflects only the “wiki” element of the Complainant’s mark, the contents of the websites associated with a majority of the disputed domain names clearly indicate that the Respondent sought to create the appearance of an association with the Complainant. In respect of <wikiproficiency.org>, the display of the Complainant’s device mark similarly implies a connection to the Complainant. The disputed domain names <wikiproficiency.co>, <wikiproficiency.info> are identical to the Respondent’s other domain names. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered all the disputed domain names in bad faith. WIPO Overview, 3.1.”

Finally, Complainant contends the examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are intended to be illustrative, rather than an exclusive list of all circumstances from which such bad faith may be found. In light of the above, Respondents are holding the Domain Names willfully, in bad faith, and in complete disregard of Complainant’s exclusive rights to use its WIKIPEDIA mark.

B. Respondents

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in its claim, Complainant must demonstrate that the three elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied. These elements are that:

- (i) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondents have no rights to or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names; and
- (iii) Respondents have registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to two nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges it has reason to believe that these registrants are the same entity or under common control. Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the registrants in accordance with paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

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 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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") section 4.11.2.

Complainant argues it is highly unlikely that the Domain Names, which contain the nearly identical and detailed strings – “wikiexpertinc” and “wikiexpertsinc” – were registered without the registrants being connected to each other. Furthermore, regarding the Domain Name <wikiexpertsinc.com>, the registrant is listed as “Ecommerce Company” and “Joseph Lewis.” Joseph Lewis has been involved in several other UDRP proceedings targeting Complainant and in which consolidation was ordered. See e.g. *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Joseph Lewis, Ecommerce Company; Kevin Lesnar, Infinity Project Manager; Soft Fellow*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2343](#) (panel permitted consolidation of multiple domain name disputes where domain names listed nominally different registrants, including Joseph Lewis, and the domain names were registered with different registrars); *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Ahmed Ali, Petr Pavlovskii, Joseph Lewis, Ecommerce Company, Daniyal Sheikh, plumbing Jack*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5104](#) (panel permitted consolidation of multiple domain name disputes where domain names listed nominally different registrants, including Joseph Lewis, and were registered with different registrars). The same registrant has also been involved in other UDRP cases where consolidation was found to be appropriate and there appeared to be a scheme of using false identities and fake Whois details while targeting a trademark owner. See *99designs, Inc. v. Usman Ghaznavi a/k/a Usman Anis / Salman Ghaznavi a/k/a Salman Anis / Logojeeves, Inc. / Logo Bench / Kevin Brown, Ghostwriting Studio / James Anderson, Crazy Media LLC / David Smith / Malik Imran, Design Hub Solution / Waqas Ghouri, LogoMashup / Stuart Marsh / Daphne Magsi / Monica Lawrence, DesignExperts / Joseph Lewis, Ecommerce Company / Angel Hostings / Archie Nolan*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-1899](#). Complainant asserts the Whois details for the nominal registrants of the Domain Names are not to be trusted. For example, Complainant has found no registered company in Texas called “Ecommerce Company.” In addition, the address in the Whois details refers to “Houston,” while the phone number is a Chinese number. The Domain Name <wikiexpertinc.org> refers to an address in Pakistan, which is a location that has also been associated with Joseph Lewis in previous UDRP cases where consolidation was ordered.

The Panel observes that the registrants of the Domain Names did not attempt to rebut any of Complainant's statements or contest Complainant's consolidation request. Instead, we have no submission of a Response or any other communication from the registrants. The Panel finds that the listed registrants for the Domain Names, using fake registration details, are likely part of a common plan and operation controlled by a single source. The registrant listed as Joseph Lewis appears to be a serial abuser who has previously targeted Complainant using fake identities and alter egos. 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 Domain Name registrants (referred to as "Respondents") in a single proceeding.

B. 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 Complainant's trademark and the Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown long-standing and well-established rights in respect of its distinctive WIKIPEDIA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that the mark is recognizable within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Panel finds the Domain Names is confusingly similar to Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy, and the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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; see also *The Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Abid Karmali*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0708](#) ("It is the consensus view of UDRP panels, with which the Panel agrees, that a *prima facie* case advanced by the complainant will generally be sufficient for the complainant to be deemed to have satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, provided the respondent does not come forward with evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name").

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Respondents are not licensees of or otherwise affiliated with Complainant. Complainant has not authorized Respondents to register the Domain Names. There is no showing that Respondents are commonly known by the Domain Names. Moreover, Respondents have not made any preparations to use the Domain Names or a name corresponding to them in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor used the Domain Names for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use purpose. The website connected to the Domain Name <wikiexpertsinc.com> uses Complainant's logotype and trademark while not including a sufficiently prominent disclaimer clarifying that Respondent is unaffiliated with Complainant. Further, the Domain Name <wikiexpertinc.org> merely redirects to Complainant's own official website or to a blank page, which does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests.

Respondents have not rebutted Complainant's *prima facie* showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. Instead, we only have evidence of Respondents using fake identities

and false registration details, as discussed above. Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that Complainant demonstrate Respondents registered and are using the Domain Names in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1, states, “bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant’s mark.”

For the reasons discussed under this and the preceding headings, the Panel considers that Respondents’ conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the Domain Names within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel observes that the WIKIPEDIA mark is a distinctive and well-known trademark. It is apparent that Respondents intentionally and unfairly targeted Complainant’s mark when registering the Domain Names. See *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Domain Administrator, PrivacyGuardian.org / John Ray*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0010](#) (“By registering the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant’s well-known trademark, Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant’s trademark. It is inconceivable that Respondent was ignorant of Complainant’s marks at the time of registration.”); *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Gwinel Madiisse*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1250](#) (August 14, 2017) (“The disputed domain names were registered more than a decade after the Complainant registered its WIKIPEDIA and WIKINEWS marks. Both those marks have garnered very substantial goodwill in the meantime, in particular in the Internet environment. They are both distinctive trademarks. It is inconceivable that the Respondent was ignorant of the marks and the goodwill vesting in the Complainant at the time of registration of both of the disputed domain names”).

Moreover, Respondents have used the Domain Names in bad faith, first through the website for the Domain Name <wikiexpertsinc.com>, which appears to confusingly associate itself with Complainant, and secondly, for the Domain Name <wikiexpertinc.org>, which redirects to Complainant’s website or to a blank page. As to this Domain Name, having reviewed the record and noting the distinctiveness and reputation of Complainant’s WIKIPEDIA mark, any passive holding of this Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, for all of the above reasons, the Panel concludes the Domain Names were registered and used in bad faith. Accordingly, Complainant has satisfied 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 Domain Names, <wikiexpertinc.org> and <wikiexpertsinc.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Christopher S. Gibson/
Christopher S. Gibson
Sole Panelist
Date: July 7, 2025