

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Vladislav Dashkiev
Case No. D2025-1671

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL c/o Walters Law Group, United States.

The Respondent is Vladislav Dashkiev, Kyrgyzstan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mega-personal.org> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

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 Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 25, 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 Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 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 28, 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 May 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 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, since at least 2004, been offering online social introduction and dating services under its MEGAPERSONALS mark from its website hosted at its domain name <megapersonals.com>, which it registered on June 12, 2003.

The Complainant's mark is registered under United States Trademark Registration No. 6432591 MEGAPERSONALS in class 45, having a registration date of July 27, 2021, and a first use in commerce date of March 30, 2004.

The Complainant has succeeded in various UDRP cases involving its mark, and its mark has been recognized as being well known. See, for example, *Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Tafe Hamilton*, WIPO Case No. [DME2023-0021](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on January 12, 2025, and currently resolves to a website entitled "MegaPersonal", featuring the following statement above a picture of a scantily clad woman: "MegaPersonal is your gateway to meaningful connections and exciting moments!". The user is asked whether they are older than 18 years of age, and if the user clicks "Yes" they are redirected to various adult-themed websites.

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 was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's mark to direct Internet users to websites which compete with the Complainant for the Respondent's commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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. A domain name which consists of an obvious misspelling of the trademark, as in this case, 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 mere change from singular to plural or vice versa (as in this case) is not sufficient to avoid confusing similarity. *i2 Technologies Inc v. Richard Alexander Smith*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0164](#).

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.

For the reasons discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name in these circumstances cannot represent a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1981](#).

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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant’s mark for the Respondent’s commercial gain, falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a widely known trademark, as in this case, by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

As discussed above, prior panels under the Policy have recognised the reputability of the Complainant's mark, Internet searches for the Complainant's mark return results overwhelmingly relating to the Complainant, and the disputed domain name is virtually identical to the Complainant's mark which was in use for over 20 years prior to registration of the disputed domain name. Internet searches for the second-level portion of the disputed domain name, "mega-personal", also prominently return results relating to the Complainant, highlighting the likelihood of confusion.

The Respondent redirects the disputed domain name to competitors of the Complainant, which points to bad faith targeting. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent's failure to take part in the present proceeding where an explanation is certainly called for. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

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 <mega-personal.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: June 20, 2025