

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Tiger Media Inc. v. OMAR ANDRES QUINTO DE LA CRUZ  
Case No. D2025-1799

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Tiger Media Inc. c/o Silverstein Legal, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is OMAR ANDRES QUINTO DE LA CRUZ, Peru.

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

The disputed domain name <juicyads.blog> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 5, 2025. On May 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 7, 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 May 7, 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 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on May 7, 2025. However, the Respondent did not submit any formal Response. The Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with Panel Appointment on May 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O'Farrell 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**

The Complainant, Tiger Media Inc., runs an advertising network located at “www.juicyads.com”, as shown in Annex 4 to the Complaint, for which it claims to have been using its trademark JUICYADS since April 2, 2006, in connection with these services.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for the JUICYADS, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3,997,885 JUICYADS, registered on July 19, 2011, in class 35;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 017534223 JUICYADS, registered on March 9, 2018, in class 35;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00917534223 JUICYADS, registered on March 9, 2018, in class 35; and
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA1064328 JUICYADS, registered on November 26, 2019, in class 35.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on September 28, 2023, which resolves to a webpage displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo and offering similar ads services. Further, the evidence provided with the Complaint shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name and other channels to conduct illegitimate activities through impersonation 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant registered the JUICYADS mark and long after the Complainant began using the mark.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor is the Respondent otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's mark for any purpose. On information and belief, the Respondent is not commonly known as “JuicyAds”.

The website to which the disputed domain name resolves is a fraudulent traffic scheme that mimics the “JuicyAds” brand and exploits its goodwill to mislead users and facilitate abusive activity.

Since 2017, the Respondent has repeatedly been suspended for violating the Complainant's JuicyAds' platform policies and has built a system for delivering fraudulent traffic to JuicyAds, resulting in the suspension of dozens of accounts. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and markets this fraudulent scheme as though it were affiliated with the Complainant. Evidence of this bad faith impersonation and misuse of the Complainant's mark includes:

- A WhatsApp account falsely represents itself as the Complainant's customer support representative. The account includes an avatar and phone number, and initiates chats with language implying affiliation with the Complainant.
- A YouTube video promoting a service at the disputed domain name under the title "Juicyads link directo ¡¡NOVEDAD!! 2023 2024" (which means "Juicyads direct link NEW!! 2023 2024" in English), again misappropriating the Complainant's mark and displaying what appears to be a spoofed version of the Complainant's interface.
- Publicly soliciting payments for this fraudulent traffic service through a PayPal account registered to the Respondent's email address as confirmed by the Registrar, which is not connected to the Complainant in any way.
- Using the Complainant's mark and branding on internal pages of the disputed domain name website, including a "Stats" dashboard that mimics the Complainant's platform.
- Operating a fake "Campaign Management" section under the banner "Juicyads Campaign Management", requesting deposits in PayPal or USDT, and displaying fake advertising management tools using the Complainant's branding.

None of these uses constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Instead, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in an intentional and deceptive effort to impersonate the Complainant and profit from misleading third parties.

The Respondent is using an identical disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a competing website for commercial gain.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On May 7, 2025, the Respondent sent several email communications in Spanish, indicating that it bought the disputed domain name and asking what the Complaint was about.

## **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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Panel disregards the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".blog" for the confusingly similarity test since it is viewed as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 1.11.1. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark JUICYADS mentioned in section 4 above (Factual Background) when it registered the disputed domain name on September 28, 2023, particularly considering the use of the Complainant’s trademark on the website at the disputed domain name.

In accordance with section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Panel considers that the inclusion of the Complainant’s widely known JUICYADS trademark in the disputed domain name, by the Respondent who has no relationship with the Complainant, creates a presumption of bad faith registration. The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, targeted the Complainant’s business and its trademark JUICYADS, with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant’s trademark for its own monetary benefit.

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name is also a significant factor that contributes to the finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was used by the Respondent to confuse Internet users and lead them to think that the website to which the disputed domain resolves belongs to or is sponsored by the Complainant, and thereby benefit from the fame and prestige of the Complainant’s JUICYADS trademark. Further, the disputed domain name has been used in connection with illegitimate

activities as described in section 5 above. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The Panel finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been fulfilled, and 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 <juicyads.blog> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Miguel B. O'Farrell/*

**Miguel B. O'Farrell**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2025