

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Arrise Limited v. Customer Help, help solutions
Case No. D2025-2374

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Arrise Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Wiley Rein LLP, United States of America (the “United States”).

The Respondent is Customer Help, help solutions, Australia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arrisse.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 16, 2025. On June 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 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 (Withheld For Privacy Ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 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 amended Complaint on June 23, 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 June 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Gonalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 Arrise Limited, a company incorporated in the British Virgin Islands and operating in Gibraltar. The Complainant is part of a group that services Pragmatic Play, a leading provider of mobile and desktop casino games in the online gaming industry, which operates in various jurisdictions worldwide, including the United States.

The Complainant registered the domain name <arrise.com> on June 21, 2023, and the domain name <arrisecareers.com> on July 19, 2023. The latter is used as a platform for job seekers. Content began being published on both websites and associated social media accounts in August 2023.

The Complainant promotes its services under the ARRISE mark through public relation campaigns, social media platforms (LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, Instagram), and regular appearances at tier-I industry award events via Pragmatic Play.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for ARRISE including:

- European Union Trademark No. 018926949, registered on January 20, 2024;
- European Union Trademark No. 018926982, registered on January 20, 2024; and
- European Union Trademark No. 018927086, registered on January 20, 2024.

On June 3, 2024, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <arrisse.com> with NameCheap, Inc. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website but has email functionality. The Respondent has used email addresses at the disputed domain name to impersonate Arrise employees and contact customers of the Complainant, requesting the transfer of banking and payment information. The emails copied actual Arrise employee names and formats, misleading recipients into believing the communications were genuine. At least one customer was deceived and redirected funds intended for the Complainant to a fraudulent account.

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:

1. the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark ARRISE.
2. the addition of a second "s" constitutes a minor typographical deviation and is an example of typosquatting.
3. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.
4. the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and was never authorized to use the ARRISE mark.
5. the disputed domain name was used to impersonate the Complainant in fraudulent email communications, redirecting funds from at least one customer.
6. such use of the disputed domain name evidences registration and use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove, on a balance of probabilities, 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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel addresses each of these elements in turn.

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 ARRISE mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name <arrisse.com> is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel notes that the addition of a second "s" constitutes a minor typographical deviation and is a typical example of typosquatting. Such misspellings do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

This finding aligns with previous UDRP decisions involving the Complainant, notably *Arrise Limited v. David Larson*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1988](#) and *Arrise Limited v. Oklah Homsa*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0641](#), where panels concluded that similarly misspelled domain names were confusingly similar to the ARRISE mark and constituted instances of typosquatting.

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 illegal activity, here involving impersonation of the Complainant's employees and fraudulent email communications requesting the redirection of funds, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <arrisse.com> on June 3, 2024, more than five months after the Complainant had secured registered trademark rights in the ARRISE mark. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website but is configured with email functionality. Evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the Respondent used email addresses associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate Arrise employees and contact third parties requesting the transfer of funds, resulting in at least one known instance of financial fraud.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity — here, impersonation, passing off, and 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.

This conduct also falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which provides that using a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use. Although the Respondent did not file a Response, the evidence on record demonstrates that the disputed domain name was not only registered in bad faith but actively used as part of a fraudulent email scheme targeting the Complainant's business.

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 <arrisse.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira/

Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2025