

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

priceline.com LLC v. ROJUST, Oldisc.LCD  
Case No. D2025-1344

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is priceline.com LLC, United States of America, represented by Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is ROJUST, Oldisc.LCD, Singapore.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <advancedprice-lineglobal.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 2, 2025. On April 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 7, 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 (Unidentified Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 16, 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 April 17, 2025.

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 April 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on May 21, 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 United States of America online travel booking and travel agency services doing business for more than 25 years.

The Complainant's primary domain name is <priceline.com> and it has sold more than 100 million plane tickets and, on average, it sells 2.5 million hotel room nights per month.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of trademarks for PRICELINE and variations thereof in different jurisdictions. By way of example:

United States Patent and Trademark Office for PRICELINE with registration number 2,272,659, registered on August 24, 1999.

United States Patent and Trademark Office for PRICELINE.COM with registration number 2,481,112, registered on August 28, 2001.

The disputed domain name <advancedprice-lineglobal.com> was registered on January 30, 2025, and resolved to a website with the header "Priceline.com – The Best Deals on Hotels, Flights and Rental Cars". The sole content on the website was a login page that featured the Complainant's PRICELINE trademark and color scheme while requesting the users usernames and passwords. Currently the disputed domain name is inactive.

#### **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 that the disputed domain name completely incorporates PRICELINE and simply adds the descriptive terms "advanced" and "global".

The Complainant also alleges that the Respondent has no authorization to use the disputed domain name, nor there is indication that the Respondent is known under the disputed domain name. Besides, the Complainant's trademarks are known but it is incorporated in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent knew or had reason to know of the Complainant's long and continuous use of PRICELINE and used the disputed domain name to trick Complainant's customers into revealing usernames and passwords apparently in an attempt to perpetrate a phishing scheme.

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

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

There are no exceptional circumstances within paragraph 5(f) of the Rules to prevent the Panel from determining the dispute based upon the Complaint, notwithstanding the failure of the Respondent to file a Response. Under paragraph 14(a) of the Rules in the event of such a “default” the Panel is still required “to proceed with a decision on the complaint”, whilst under paragraph 14(b) it “shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate”. This dispute resolution procedure is accepted by the domain name registrant as a condition of registration.

### 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 entirety of the PRICELINE mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. 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 terms here, “advanced”, “global”, and a hyphen 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 name 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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that none of the circumstances described in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy can be inferred from the file.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The Panel notes how the website to which the disputed domain resolved reproduced the Complainant's trademark and color scheme seemingly in an attempt to confuse Internet users to enter their passwords. Such practice is deemed to be an attempt to collect personal data illegally, that is to say, phishing.

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

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

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Currently as the Panel has checked the disputed domain name is inactive and finds that in the circumstances of this case meets the passive holding doctrine, so as to declare a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Considering the use of the disputed domain name at the time of filing of Complaint, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing 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 name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent targeted the Complainant. While the mark is a coined term and it has achieved well-known recognition in the United States of America, the Respondent reproduced an exact copy of the Complainant's PRICELINE trademark and color scheme on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved. This leads the Panel to the conclusion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in awareness of the Complainant and its trademarks and therefore, in bad faith.

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 name <advancedprice-lineglobal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Manuel Moreno-Torres/*

**Manuel Moreno-Torres**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2025