

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Jennifer Dell, Islam Apon, Islam Apon, THALIA CREAR, Tonmoy Parves, Niche Empire, and Ashikur Rahman, Ashikur Rahman
Case No. D2025-1663

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Walters Law Group, United States.

The Respondents are Jennifer Dell, United States, Islam Apon, Islam Apon, Bangladesh, THALIA CREAR, United States, Tonmoy Parves, Niche Empire, and Ashikur Rahman, Ashikur Rahman, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <megapersonels.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC.

The disputed domain names <megapersonanal.com> and <nmegapersonals.com> are registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com.

The disputed domain names <megapersonal-eu.com> and <megapersonals-us.com> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB.

The disputed domain names <megapersonals.biz> and <megapersonls.pro> are registered with Dynadot Inc.

The disputed domain name <megapersonalsclassified.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc.

The above registrars are referred to below as the "Registrar(s)".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 24, 2025. On April 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 25, 27, 28, and May 13, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondents (Redacted for Privacy, Whois

Privacy Protection Service by onamae.com, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org), Redacted for Privacy, and Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 13, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 May 13, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 5, 2025. One of the Respondents sent three email communications to the Center on May 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on June 17, 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 has supplied online social introduction and dating services under the mark MEGAPERSONALS since 2004.

The Complainant owns a United States trade mark No. 6,432,591 for MEGAPERSONALS, registered on July 27, 2021, in class 45.

The Complainant operates websites at "www.megapersonals.com" and "www.megapersonals.eu".

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

<megaparsonels.com>: December 7, 2023
<megapersoanal.com>: August 28, 2024
<megapersonals-us.com>: February 7, 2025
<megapersonal-eu.com>: February 8, 2025
<nmegapersonals.com>: February 12, 2025
<megapersonls.pro>: February 25, 2025
<megapersonals.biz>: February 25, 2025
<megapersonalsclassified.com>: March 5, 2025

The Respondents are collectively referred to hereafter as "the Respondent", unless it is necessary to refer to them separately.

At various dates between February 28, 2025, and April 9, 2025, all of the disputed domain names resolved to websites branded with the Complainant's "MegaPersonals personals classifieds" logo.

In the case of the following disputed domain names, the websites invited users to either "Start Here" or to log in using an existing account: <megaparsonels.com>; <megapersonals.biz>; <megapersonalsclassified.com>; <megapersonals-us.com>; and <megapersonls.pro>.

The websites at the disputed domain names <megapersoanal.com>, <mmegapersonals.com>, <megapersonal-eu.com> replicated the Complainant's exact homepage in that, in addition to the Complainant's logo, they included the Complainant's blue "POST NOW" button plus cartoon graphic, a prominent "MEET NOW" strapline in green font, and a series of coloured "W seek M" etc buttons.

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease and desist letters sent between April 4 and 9, 2025.

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.

B. Respondent

While the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, the Center received three emails on May 25, 2025, from the [...]@ofaex.com email address listed for the Respondent Apon in connection with the disputed domain names <megapersoanal.com> and <nmegapersonals.com>. Two of the emails stated that the disputed domain name <megapersonals.com> is "currently active under a different registrar and was not registered through us". The third email stated: "We are domain resellers who purchase domains from the registry and provide them to our clients. The domain mentioned in the report was not purchased through our system." All emails were signed: "Domains Manager, Ofaex It Solutions".

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain names are subject to common control, this not having been denied by the Respondents,¹ and that, in the circumstances, consolidation is fair and equitable to all parties, and also procedurally efficient. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.

In particular, the Panel notes that: (1) all of the disputed domain names have been used to resolve to websites impersonating the Complainant by prominent use of its logo, and that the disputed domain names fall into two groups of identical websites (see section 4 above), each of which spans more than one Registrar; (2) three pairs of the disputed domain names share the same registrant and at least six of the disputed domain names include contact details relating to Bangladesh (e.g., by telephone country code); (3) the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short three-month period, with five of the disputed domain names being registered in February 2025; and (4) the disputed domain names are generally similar in structure in that five constitute typo-squatting, and two constitute the Complainant's trade mark plus another term.

¹ While, as discussed in section 5B above, a domain name reseller has emailed the Center via the registrant email address used for two of the disputed domain names claiming not to have resold another of the disputed domain names, the Panel does not consider that these communications, which raise more questions than they answer, amount to an indication that the disputed domain names are not subject to common control.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognisable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain name <megapersonals.biz> is identical to, and the other disputed domain names are confusingly similar to, the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

As regards the disputed domain names <megapersonalsclassified.com>, <megapersonals-us.com>, and <megapersonal-eu.com>, although the addition of other terms (here, "classified", "us", and "eu"), 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.

Furthermore, as regards the disputed domain names <megapersonals.com>, <megapersonals.pro>, <megapersonal.com>, <mmegapersonals.com>, and <megapersonal-eu.com>, a domain name that consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trade mark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [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 recognised 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 domain names for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off, phishing or other types of fraud (noting the login feature), can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. See further under the third element below.

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 held that the use of domain names for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off, phishing or other types of fraud (noting the login feature), 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.

In particular, the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant including by prominent use of the Complainant's logo, most likely for phishing or other fraudulent purposes.

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 <megapersonals.com>, <megapersoanal.com>, <megapersonal-eu.com>, <megapersonals.biz>, <megapersonalsclassified.com>, <megapersonals-us.com>, <megapersonls.pro>, and <nmegapersonals.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: July 1, 2025