

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. MATE SERVICE CO., LIMITED

Case No. D2025-2342

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), Switzerland, represented by K&L Gates, Australia.

The Respondent is MATE SERVICE CO., LIMITED, China, represented by Arun Chauhan, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fifacoin.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 16, 2025. On June 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 16, 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 (Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not submit an amendment to the Complaint at that time.

The Center verified that 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 June 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 15, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on July 15, 2025.

On July 28, 2025, the Complainant filed an unsolicited supplemental filing, to which the Respondent replied on July 29, 2025, objecting to the Complainant’s supplemental filing.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa, Warwick Rothnie and Sebastian Hughes as panelists in this matter on August 5, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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.

On August 8, 2025, the Panel issued a Procedural Order inviting the Respondent to submit a substantive response to the Complainant's supplemental filing and to provide evidence that it is authorized to communicate on behalf of MATE SERVICE CO., LIMITED, China, the verified registrant of the disputed domain name.

On August 15, 2025, the Respondent submitted its substantive response to the Complainant's supplemental filing.

On August 20, 2025, the Complainant submitted an additional unsolicited supplemental filing.

On August 24, the Respondent submitted another unsolicited supplemental filing.

4. Factual Background

For more than a century, the Complainant has been the world governing body of the sport of football. It organizes international football tournaments including the FIFA World Cup and the FIFA Women's World Cup.

The Complainant is the proprietor of numerous trademark registrations for its FIFA mark, including the following:

- International Trademark No. 633108 for FIFA (word mark), registered on February 22, 1995, for goods in classes 25 and 28;
- International Trademark No. 747778 for **FIFA** (device mark), registered on June 2, 2000, for goods and services in classes 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 (including "coins"), 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42; and
-
- United Kingdom Trade mark No. 909027343 for **FIFA** (device mark), registered on October 14, 2010, for goods and services in classes 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 45.

The Complainant operates its primary website at the domain name <fifa.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 20, 2012. At the time of the Complaint, it resolved to a website entitled "FIFA Coins" that purports to be a platform for buying and selling "coins" related to football, displaying a photograph of a football match and links entitled "FC 25 Coins", "FC 25 Players," etc. The website displays the following "About Us" text:

"This site established in 2012, engaging in becoming the world-class trading platform of Sports FC 25 games. Our business has already spread to Europe, North and South America, Asia, and Arabia, etc. With rapid development over a decade, our site has currently become a popular brand among Sports FC 25 gamers, Sports FC 25 Gamers."

The website displays icons of various third-party payment services and social media platforms and lists the site operator as Mate Service Co. Limited with an address in London, United Kingdom. The appearance, if not the contents, of the website was somewhat altered at the time of the Decision. The website does not include a disclaimer describing the relationship with the Complainant.

On March 18, 2025, the Complainant sent an e-mail to Mate Service Co. Ltd (United Kingdom), asking it to state the basis upon which it used the FIFA mark on the website. On March 21, 2025, Mate Service Co. Ltd (United Kingdom) responded in relevant part as follows:

"Fifacoin.com operates as an independent trading platform. We do not claim any affiliation with FIFA, nor do we present ourselves as an official partner, licensee, or sponsor of FIFA or its events. Any references to FIFA that previously appeared on our platform were not intended to mislead or infringe upon FIFA's rights. To address FIFA's concerns, we have proactively removed all references to 'FIFA' from our website and marketing materials."

On March 25, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist notice to Mate Service Co. Ltd (United Kingdom), which responded on April 16, 2025, requesting a 12-month delay in transferring the disputed domain name in light of its ongoing commercial operations. Subsequently, this Complaint was filed by the Complainant.

The Respondent has been identified by the Registrar as MATE SERVICE CO., LIMITED (China). The Response and Supplemental Filing were filed by Mate Service Co., Ltd (United Kingdom), which is listed as the operator of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves. The Parties' Supplemental Filings (below) discuss the identity of the Respondent.

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:

- (a) To fund its tournaments, the Complainant maintains a licensing program with official licensees, to which the Complainant grants exclusive marketing, media, and other commercial rights including rights to the Complainant's valuable FIFA mark. The disputed domain name reflects this mark in its entirety together with a descriptive term.
- (b) The Respondent is not authorized or licensed by or affiliated with the Complainant and is not licensed to use the FIFA trademark. It uses the disputed domain name to operate a platform that provides automated sales of virtual in-game tokens/currency used in football-related video games. From 1993 to 2022, the Complainant's licensee published video games that included in-game tokens or currency previously called "FC Coins", "FUT Coins" and "FIFA Points." The Respondent's website was never licensed, sponsored or approved by the Complainant or its then-licensee, and the activities conducted by the Respondent's business were specifically prohibited by that licensee.
- (c) The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in connection with a business enabling users to buy tokens for use in football-related games published by the Complainant's previous licensee. At no time were "FIFA Coin" products offered by that licensee and the Respondent was not permitted to resell the tokens by their issuer at any time. Additionally, prior to these proceedings, the Respondent acknowledged that it has no rights in the FIFA mark and removed references to the Complainant from its website, yet failed to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent identifies itself as "Mate Services Co Ltd" with an address in London, United Kingdom.

- (a) The Respondent's disputed domain name is neither identical nor confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark FIFA. It is a coined and composite expression "fifacoin" formed by the fusion of two widely recognized generic terms "FIFA" and "coin."
- (b) The website at the disputed domain name has operated continuously since 2012 as a third-party digital item exchange platform for gamers. Consumers do not associate FIFACOIN with FIFA, the football governing body. Instead, they recognize it as an independent platform.
- (c) The Respondent's service has been featured in over 3,500 Trustpilot reviews; 3,600+ Facebook followers; 5,900+ X (formerly Twitter) followers; 2,700+ Instagram followers; 3,600+ Discord members; 2,100+ YouTube subscribers; and 10+ million lifetime website visitors.
- (d) The platform uses no official FIFA logos, trade dress, or protected trademarks beyond the descriptive use of the term "FIFA", which itself is employed to reference the well-known gaming series. Moreover, disclaimers and clear language indicate the site's independent status.
- (e) The Complainant's delay in bringing the Complaint suggest acquiescence.
- (f) At the time that the disputed domain name was registered, there were no known efforts by the Complainant to develop or announce a product called "FIFA Coin" or any similar digital initiative. EA, the publisher of the FIFA game series, referred to in-game currency as "FIFA Points" or "FUT Coins" and not "FIFA Coin".
- (g) The Complainant, having issued a demand transfer, failed to respond to the Respondent's request for a one-year transition of the disputed domain name.
- (h) The Complaint is an example of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking for the following reasons: The domain was registered more than 12 years ago. The Complainant has never offered a product called "FIFA Coin". The Respondent has consistently acted in good faith. No evidence of consumer confusion has been submitted. The Respondent offered reasonable compromise proposals, which were ignored by the Complainant.

The Respondent requests that the Complaint be denied and that the Panel make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.2 Supplemental Filings

A. Complainant's Supplemental Filings

Complainant's First Supplemental Filing

On July 28, 2025, the Complainant sent an unsolicited Supplemental Filing to the Center.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent identified in the Response as the beneficial holder of the disputed domain name (Mate Service Co. Ltd, United Kingdom) was legally dissolved on May 6, 2025, prior to the filing of the Complaint and Response. Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) At the time of the Complaint, the Respondent had no legal personality and could not have any right or interest in the disputed domain name.
- b) The Respondent cannot own any reputation or goodwill in the disputed domain name or "FIFACOIN" as an independent brand; any such would have vested in the British Crown upon dissolution of the company. The Respondent does not currently exist and cannot own assets.

The Complainant notes historical changes to the Respondent's website concerning the identity of the website operator. Prior to 2024, no operator was identified. During several months in 2024, it was identified as "Mingyu Service Limited" with an address in "Hong Kong". Since November 2024, the website operator was identified as Mate Service Co. Limited, United Kingdom.

The Complainant refutes the Respondent's arguments about delay in bringing the proceedings, stating that the disputed domain name was only acquired and therefore registered by the Respondent at some time after 2022, when Mate Service Co. Ltd, United Kingdom ("UK") was incorporated. This is the relevant time for assessing bad faith, not 2012 as asserted by the Respondent. The Whois extract shows that the disputed domain name registration details were updated on 22 September 2023. While the actual date is masked by a privacy service, it can be inferred that the disputed domain name was transferred to Mate Service Co Limited on this date. The Respondent's failure to address this indicates bad faith.

The Complainant notes that the Respondent's alleged disclaimer, displayed in its "Terms and Conditions" page, previously stated that *"FUT coins are (and will always be) the property of EA Sports. We have no relationship or cooperation with the authorities."* The disclaimer was amended on or after July 2, 2025, to include a reference to FIFA. The word FIFACOIN appeared on the top left-hand corner of the website on or before April 2, 2025.

Complainant's Second Supplemental Filing

On August 20, 2025, the Complainant submitted a further unsolicited Supplementary Filing, responding to the Respondent's Second Supplemental Filing, and making further submissions and filing further evidence in support of the Complainant's contention that the disputed domain name has not been continuously under the same ownership.

B. Respondent's Supplemental Filings

Respondent's First Supplemental Filing

On July 29, 2025, the Respondent sent an unsolicited Supplemental Filing to the Center, objecting to the Complainant's First Supplemental Filing, and requesting additional time to file a more complete response should the Panel decide to admit the Complainant's First Supplemental Filing. The Respondent states that the disputed domain name has always remained under the control of the same business and core team. Mate Service Co. Ltd. (UK), to which the Complainant refers, was used solely for administrative purposes and was never the registrant or beneficial owner of the domain. Furthermore, the group includes Mate Service Co. Ltd. registered in "Hong Kong", which remains an active legal entity. The disputed domain name has not been transferred in a manner that alters beneficial ownership or operational control.

Respondent's Second Supplemental Filing

On August 15, 2025, in response to the Panel's Procedural Order, the Respondent sent a Supplemental Filing to the Center.

The Respondent objects to the Complainant's unsolicited supplemental filing, which addresses the Response rather than containing information previously not known to the Complainant.

Without prejudice to the above, the Respondent contends that the disputed domain name has continuously been under the same ownership and under the same Registrar account. It was originally registered on December 20, 2012, a full decade before the UK company "Mate Service Co. Ltd" was formed and it has never been transferred to any unrelated third party in the interim. The dissolution of this entity in May 2025 had no effect on the ownership of the disputed domain name. The Respondent states, in part:

"The UK company was a mere administrative vehicle within a larger business structure, never the ultimate owner of the domain or business. It was formed for administrative convenience and was 'never the beneficial owner of the domain name', which at all times was owned/controlled by the broader group. Upon that entity's formal dissolution (a voluntary strike-off for dormancy), its nominal assets escheated to the Crown by operation of UK law but critically, the fifacoin.com domain was not among those assets, as it was not owned by the UK company in any real sense."

The Mingyu Services Ltd entity introduced by the Complainant was one of related businesses of the Respondent and its brief appearance on the website are of no bearing on the case.

The disclaimers on the website always properly disclaimed that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant nor with EA, the gaming provider. The Respondent demonstrated good faith by amending its website to remove references to “FIFA” and by offering to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant after a period of transition. The Complainant did not accept this offer. Therefore, the disputed domain name should remain with the Respondent.

Respondent’s Third Supplemental Filing

On August 24, 2025, the Respondent sent a further unsolicited Supplemental Filing to the Center, in response to the Complainant’s Second Supplemental Filing, and providing further submissions and evidence in opposition to the Complainant’s contentions that the disputed domain name has not been continuously under the same ownership.

A. Discussion of Supplemental Filings

Neither the Rules nor the Supplemental Rules make express provision for supplemental filings, except at the request of the panel (see paragraph 12 of the Rules). Generally, UDRP panels only accept supplemental filings in exceptional circumstances where such a filing clearly shows its relevance to the case and the filing party shows that it was unable to provide the information contained therein in the original complaint or response (see section 4.6 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”)).

Having reviewed the parties’ respective Supplemental Filings, the Panel notes that the materials in the record (the Complaint, Registrant Verification and Response) revealed a discrepancy between the verified registrant (MATE SERVICE CO., LTD, China) and the party purporting to be the Respondent (Mate Service Co. Ltd., United Kingdom). As the Respondent notes, the Complainant’s Supplemental Filing provides information on this and other relevant issues, some of which could have been known to the Complainant at the time of filing of the Complaint. There is some force in the Respondent’s objection. The Complainant does cite some authority for its approach here. While the circumstances of each particular case need to be taken into account, generally speaking the Panel would not condone that approach going forward. It leads to duplication of effort by both parties, the administration of the dispute and the panel. In most cases, the appropriate time for the Complainant to address the disclosure of a different respondent to the named respondent is after notification of the Registrar’s verification response, not after the filing of the Response. As noted above, however, the Complainant’s supplemental filing is relevant to the issues in dispute. Accordingly, the Panel provided the Respondent the opportunity to respond to the Complainant’s filing. The Panel considers that the Parties’ Supplemental Filings contain relevant information that affects the Panel’s findings under the UDRP.

Accordingly, but not without considerable reservations in light of the extent of the unsolicited filings in this proceeding, the Supplemental Filings are admitted.

Regarding the legal status of the Respondent “Mate Service Co. Ltd”, the Panel finds that the Complainant has provided unrefuted evidence that this United Kingdom entity no longer exists. The available evidence leaves the Panel in some doubt about the relevant date on which the named registrant formally acquired rights in the disputed domain name - whether in 2012 or 2022. Nevertheless, noting the brevity and limited scope of UDRP proceedings the Panel finds that the record contains evidence sufficient to permit the Panel to admit the Response and Supplemental Filings presented by the Party acting on behalf of the named registrant of the disputed domain name (MATE SERVICE CO., LTD, China) and will therefore consider the Respondent’s submissions accordingly.

On August 20, 2025, the Center received a further unsolicited supplemental filing from the Complainant. In this supplemental filing, the Complainant provided evidence throwing substantial questions on the

Respondent's claims that the disputed domain name has been in the same beneficial ownership since its registration. These are very serious allegations, which the Respondent seeks to address in the Respondent's Third Supplemental Filing.

For the reasons set out below, however, the Panel has concluded the Complaint should succeed even if the Respondent's claims are accepted at face value.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

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

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

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 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "coin") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. The Panel finds the Respondent's contention that the Complainant's mark is a "generic term" that, together with the term "coin," constitutes a coined and composite term that would extinguish the Complainant's rights to bring this Complaint, as lacking merit. [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. It is not in dispute that

the Respondent is not authorized by the Complainant to use the FIFA mark. 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 the composition of the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant's long-established FIFA mark together with the descriptive term "coin", which does not distinguish it. The Panel notes that the Respondent provides no support for its assertion that the FIFA mark is generic and therefore unenforceable as an indication of origin. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10. Rather, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Respondent asserts that, since 2012, it has operated a bona fide business at the website to which the disputed domain name resolves. The issue before the Panel is not whether the Respondent has a right to operate a business; the issue is whether the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.

It is not in dispute that the Respondent is not and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3. By its own admission, the Respondent operates a commercial enterprise (buying and selling video game tokens) that is unrelated to the Complainant and known by entirely different names. The Panel finds that such commercial activities cannot provide a basis for rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3.

The available facts do not support a finding that the Respondent operates a genuine noncommercial fan or criticism website or was engaged in other non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor that the Respondent was operating as a reseller or distributor of the Complainant's goods or services. Under certain circumstances not found in the present case, such use could support a finding of rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8.

Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not established rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

According to established practice, bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. To facilitate assessment of whether this has occurred, and bearing in mind that the burden of proof rests with the complainant, 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds 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 Panel notes that, even if the reference date is 2012, the disputed domain name was registered more than 10 years after the Complainant registered its FIFA mark, which the Complainant has used and promoted extensively worldwide. It is not in dispute that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant in both 2012 and 2022, and that the Respondent acknowledged the Complainant's rights by agreeing to remove references to the Complainant from its website and to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

The passage of time since 2012 is not a bar to the Complaint as the remedy under the Policy is directed to avoiding abuse or damage in the future and there is no indication in the materials before the Panel that some representation or other conduct by the Complainant has induced the Respondent to act to its detriment. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.17. On the contrary, the Respondent has had the benefit of the potentially confusing disputed domain name during this time.

As noted previously, the Panel rejects as unfounded the Respondent's assertion that the FIFA mark is a generic term rather than the proprietary mark of the Complainant. The Panel also rejects as irrelevant the Respondent's assertion that the Complainant has never offered a "FIFA Coin" product, or that consumers do not associate the disputed domain name with the Complainant. Rather, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Noting the composition of the disputed domain name, length and extent of the Complainant's rights in its mark, the commercial use to which the disputed domain name has been put, the lack of rights and legitimate interests of the Respondent, the Panel finds that the available evidence supports a finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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.

The Respondent argues that its website does not contain the Complainant's mark or logos, an argument contradicted by its own admission that it previously did. Indeed, on the Complainant's demand, the Respondent removed some content from the website. Further, the Respondent's website offers transactions in tokens related to gaming specifically for football, of which the Complainant is the world governing body. The use of the disputed domain name for such a purpose is a clear example of bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Respondent states that its website disclaims the relationship between the Parties. The Panel disagrees. The "disclaimer" may be discerned, if at all, in the terms and conditions of the website and not in a location readily visible to an Internet user. It states that the Respondent is not affiliated with "the authorities", without specifying the Complainant. The Panel finds that this is not a clear and sufficiently prominent disclaimer that would lend support to circumstances suggesting the Respondent acted in good faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.7. In any event, in these proceedings it is the disputed domain name which is in issue and, in the absence of a connection with the Complainant, is itself likely to mislead or cause confusion with the Complainant's well-established reputation.

The record reviewed by the Panel leaves no doubt that the Respondent selected a domain name that reflects the Complainant's earlier mark and proceeded to use that domain name for a business related to football. The evidence in the case file as presented indicates that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark, and that there is no good-faith use to which the disputed domain name has or could be put.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Panel has reviewed the Respondent's request for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. Since the Complaint has succeeded, the Panel has no basis to consider this request. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

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 <fifacoin.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Presiding Panelist

/Warwick Rothnie/

Warwick Rothnie

Panelist

/Sebastian Hughes /

Sebastian Hughes

Panelist

Date: August 25, 2025