

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Faze Clan Inc., Faze Media, Inc. v. Prodip Mondal
Case No. D2025-2419

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Faze Clan Inc., and Faze Media, Inc. (the “Complainant”), United States of America, represented by MGL LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Prodip Mondal, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fazeclanmerchs.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 18, 2025. On June 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 19, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 20, 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 William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 an e-sports and entertainment organization of world-class professional gamers and online content creators. Established in 2010, the Complainant's divisions include nine competitive teams and currently counts a dozen of championship trophies and a hyper-engaged global fanbase of 510 million across all social platforms.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for FAZE and other FAZE-formative marks, such as FAZE CLAN, including, United States of America trademark registration FAZE No. 4550118, registered on June 17, 2014; International trademark registration FAZE CLAN No. 1450932, registered on January 16, 2019; Chinese figurative trademark registration No. 36010149, registered on September 14, 2019; and European Union trademark registration ATLANTA FAZE No. 018228769, registered on January 11, 2021.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 30, 2024, and resolves to an active website advertising/selling unauthorized merchandise in the form of products bearing the Complainant's trademarks that refer to the Complainant's business without any authorization from the latter.

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 in its first-level portion incorporates entirely the Complainant's registered trademarks FAZE and FAZE CLAN.

The Complainant adds that what it refers to as the second-level portion "merchs" is a plural version of a generic term (which is known as abbreviation of the word "merchandise") closely connected to the Complainant's business and activities, taking into consideration the "shop" section on the Complainant's official website. The term "faze" is a verb which is completely distinctive with respect to the provided products and services, as is the word "clan", according to the Complainant. The Complainant submits that for that reason, the inclusion of the terms "faze" and "clan" in the disputed domain name would undoubtedly be linked to the Complainant. The Complainant points out that previous UDRP panels have consistently held that the mere addition of a descriptive or generic term would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity to a trademark.

The Complainant says that the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on September 30, 2024, many years after the first registration of the Complainant's trademark FAZE, and adds that it has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks. The Complainant underlines that the Respondent is not affiliated to the Complainant and that it did not authorize the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name incorporating the FAZE trademark nor has the Complainant endorsed or sponsored the Respondent or the Respondent's website. The Complainant also points out that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or owns any registered trademarks including the term "fazeclanmerch.com", and that "fazeclan" and "fazeclan merch" when entered into Google search point to the Complainant. Trademark searches for "fazeclanmerch" combinations also do not point to the Respondent, the Complainant says.

The Respondent also uses a privacy service to dissimulate its identity, the Complainant points out, and the disputed domain name resolves to an active website (“the Website”) allegedly advertising and selling merchandise of the Complainant and displaying products bearing the Complainant’s trademarks without any authorization from the Complainant. This reflects the Respondent’s intention to create an association, and a subsequent likelihood of confusion, with the Complainant and its trademarks in the mind of Internet users, the Complainant maintains. According to the Complainant, there is clearly no other interest than exploiting the Complainant’s reputation, and such unlawful conduct is even more evident considering that, at the time of filing of the present Complaint, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves offer for sale unauthorized products bearing the Complainant’s trademarks, thereby affecting the Complainant’s business generating economic and reputational damages. The Complainant says that from its perspective, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name nor is it using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as it is involved in the advertising/sale of unauthorized products.

The Complainant adds that given its strong online presence, it is inconceivable, considering the content displayed on the relevant website that clearly refers to Faze Clan’s merchandise and activities, that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant’s company or trademarks when it registered the disputed domain name. It seems, on the contrary, that the Respondent is fully aware of the Complainant’s rights. The Respondent also incorporated the trademark FAZE intentionally in order to take advantage of the reputation of the trademark and goodwill of the Complainant, free-riding on the Complainant’s reputation. The Complainant says this is even more evident considering that the website at the disputed domain name offers for sale unauthorized Faze Clan products, exploiting the Complainant’s reputation for commercial gains.

As noted previously, the disputed domain name resolves to an active website advertising/selling unauthorized merchandise, namely products bearing the Complainant’s trademarks without any authorization from the latter. It is provided in WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 2.13 that “Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (...) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent”, the Complainant points out, adding that the Respondent’s activity of advertising/selling unauthorized merchandise is clear evidence of bad faith. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent’s bad faith in using the disputed domain name is even more evident considering that the latter is displayed at the bottom of the website’s homepage, in the section “FAZE CLAN OFFICIAL MERCH”, thereby attracting Internet users for commercial gain. Additionally, the relevant website’s “About” section purports that the Website is the “Official Website” for purchasing the Complainant’s merchandise, which is a false claim.

Finally, the Complainant reiterates that the WhoIs data associated with the disputed domain name shows that a privacy shield was used. According to the Complainant it is very likely that the Respondent is trying to conceal its identity, which is also evidence of bad faith.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant Faze Clan Inc. has shown rights in respect of the trademarks FAZE and FAZE CLAN for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Those trademarks are replicated as such and recognizable in the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms here, “merch” (meaning “merchandise”), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [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. 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 impersonation of the Complainant, by establishing a website to which the disputed domain name resolves, where the trademarks of the Complainant are reproduced and where sections of the website give the false and misleading impression that the website is official, connected with or established by the Complainant, 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 a domain name that includes the distinctive combination of the terms “faze” and “clan”. FAZE CLAN is one of the registered trademarks that the Complainant owns and on which it rests its case. A cursory web search and also straightforward trademark searches if undertaken by the Respondent would have immediately revealed the rights of the Complainant to FAZE CLAN as a trademark. The Complainant benefits from an extensive reputation in the online environment vested in these terms in relation to its gaming services. The addition of the term “merch” and the fact that the disputed domain name resolves to a site that mimics the Complainant’s web presence without any authorization to do so further indicate registration in bad faith.

The Respondent by these means and by its offerings on the same website, intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

Panels have in any case regularly held that impersonation of a complainant's web presence 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.

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 <fazeclanmerchs.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2025