

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Panavision International, L.P., Panavision Inc. v. Desche Draville,  
UDM Media Inc, Tin Tin, LKSoft Solutions (M) Sdn Bhd,  
Jon Som, Tin Tin  
Case No. D2025-2450

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainants are Panavision International, L.P., United States of America (“United States”), and Panavision Inc., United States, represented by Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP, United States.

The Respondents are Desche Draville, UDM Media Inc, Unites States, Tin Tin, LKSoft Solutions (M) Sdn Bhd, Malaysia, Jon Som, Singapore, and Tin Tin, Malaysia.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain names <panavisionaduit.com> and <panavision-grow.com> are registered with INTERNETX GMBH. The disputed domain names <panavision-aka.com>, <panavision-aka.net>, <panavisionanalytic.com>, <panavision.site>, <panavision-1.cyou>, and <panavision-2.cyou> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. The disputed domain names <panavision-analysis.cfd>, <panavision-audit.cfd>, <panavision-brand.cfd>, <panavision-reviews.cfd>, <panavision-survey.cfd> are registered with Aceville Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrars”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 19, 2025. On June 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 24 and 25, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for privacy / Admin Contact, PrivateName Services Inc. / UDM Media Inc. / LKSoft Solutions (M) Sdn Bhd / TMPL-EKWOXDTDBP0) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on June 25, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainants to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on July 3, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 28, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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, founded in 1954, is one of the world’s leading providers of digital imaging and cinematographic equipment, including cameras, optical lenses, lighting and accessories. Its equipment and services are relied upon by major film studios and production companies in connection with many of the most successful feature films and television series worldwide.

The Complainants operate internationally through affiliates in several countries, supported by a global network of distributors. It has received numerous prestigious awards, including from the American Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences (“Oscars”) and the Academy of Television Arts & Sciences (“Emmys”), evidencing the recognition of its technical excellence in the industry.

The Complainants own numerous trademark registrations for the sign PANAVISION across multiple jurisdictions. By way of example only, these include:

- PANAVISION (Stylised) – United States Reg. No. 627362, registered on May 22, 1956 (Class 9);
- PANAVISION – United States Reg. No. 834705, registered on September 5, 1967 (Class 9);
- PANAVISION – United States Reg. No. 3447278, registered on June 17, 2008 (Classes 9, 37, and 41).

In addition to these registrations, the Complainants own a portfolio of more than 180 PANAVISION trademarks around the world.

The Complainants have also maintained an active Internet presence since at least 1998, operating the domain name <panavision.com> and numerous other domain names incorporating the PANAVISION mark, which are used to promote its cinematographic equipment and related services.

The disputed domain names were registered between March and May 2025. Several of them, including <panavisionanalytic.com>, <panavisionaduit.com>, <panavision.site>, <panavision-aka.com>, <panavision-survey.cfd>, <panavision-reviews.cfd>, <panavision-brand.cfd>, <panavision-audit.cfd>, and <panavision-analysis.cfd> resolved to active websites imitating the Complainant’s official homepage, while others, including <panavision-grow.com>, <panavision-1.cyou>, <panavision-2.cyou>, and <panavision-aka.net> resolved to inactive or parked websites. A number of the disputed domain names even pointed to the same parked page or redirected to one another.

No further information is available about the Respondents.

## 5. Parties' Contentions

### A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainants contend that, as a result of decades of extensive use and recognition, their mark has acquired substantial goodwill and reputation. The disputed domain names wholly incorporate the mark, with the mere addition of descriptive or generic terms or numbers.

The Complainants argue that the Respondents are not affiliated with, nor authorised by, the Complainants in any way, and have no rights in or to the Complainants' mark. The latter is a fanciful word with no dictionary meaning, and third parties would not legitimately select it unless seeking to create an impression of association with the Complainants.

The Complainants further contend that several of the disputed domain names resolve to "spoofed" replicas of their official website at <panavision.com>, prominently displaying the Complainants' trademarks and purporting to offer their products. The remaining disputed domain names resolve to inactive or parked pages. The Complainants argue that such use is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use. Instead, it is intended to mislead Internet users and trade on the goodwill associated with the Complainants' PANAVISION mark.

### B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainants allege that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainants request the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainants' request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainants' request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names can be grouped into clusters, each reflecting a common registrant identity, with further connections linking the clusters to one another.

**Cluster 1** consists of <panavision-1.cyou> and <panavision-2.cyou>. Both were registered on the same day, through the same registrar, and are associated with "[...]"@proton.me" email addresses. These disputed domain names resolve to inactive or parked pages.

**Cluster 2** consists of <panavision-survey.cfd>, <panavision-reviews.cfd>, <panavision-brand.cfd>, <panavision-audit.cfd>, and <panavision-analysis.cfd>. These were registered on the same day, also through the same registrar, and resolve to spoofed replicas of the Complainants' official homepage. The registrant details are consistent across the set and point to a single underlying operator.

The Complainants note that the registrant details for **Cluster 1** and **Cluster 2** coincide in substance, differing only in minor details. Accordingly, these may reasonably be considered together as **Cluster 1A**.

**Cluster 3** consists of <panavision-aka.com>, <panavision-aka.net>, <panavision.site>, and <panavisionanalytic.com>. These were registered within a short period of time and are likewise connected to "[...][@proton.me](mailto:panavision@proton.me)" email accounts that replicate the same structural format as those in **Cluster 1A** (differing only by minor numerical variations). This similarity strongly suggests common control.

Moreover, <panavision-1.cyou> (**Cluster 1A**) and <panavision-aka.net> (**Cluster 3**) resolved to the exact same parked page, a coincidence that is unlikely to be accidental and that reinforces the inference of inter-cluster connection.

**Cluster 4** consists of <panavisionaduit.com> and <panavision-grow.com>. One of these disputed domain names resolved to a spoofed homepage identical in nature to those seen in **Cluster 2** and **Cluster 3**. Furthermore, <panavisionaduit.com> redirects Internet users to disputed domain names in other clusters, thereby directly linking **Cluster 4** to the others.

Although not every disputed domain name exhibited all of these features, the cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that the clusters are under common control.

The Panel further notes that UDRP panels have recognised consolidation where multiple domain names, despite differences in formal registrant data, were shown to be managed by the same entity through circumstantial evidence such as contemporaneous registration and shared technical infrastructure. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.11.2.

Beyond the inter-cluster links, there are elements common to all disputed domain names which further corroborate a unitary control:

- each disputed domain name follows a consistent structural pattern, combining the Complainants' mark with a descriptive suffix (e.g. "audit", "analysis", "reviews");
- the disputed domain names were all registered within a relatively narrow time frame, with several even registered on the same day, underscoring coordinated activity;
- the disputed domain names were registered through a handful of recurring registrars and are hosted on an equally limited number of nameservers operated by a small set of hosting providers.

These general features, considered together with the specific inter-cluster connections, strengthen the case for finding that the disputed domain names are ultimately under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

#### **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 Complainants have 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar 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 recognised 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants’ prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainants have never authorised the Respondent to make use of its trademarks or to register domain names incorporating them. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the designation PANAVISION or any variation thereof, nor that they hold any trademark, trade name, or corporate rights in respect of such term.

The disputed domain names have been used either for inactive or parked webpages, or – more significantly – for websites designed to imitate the Complainants’ official site.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including impersonation and passing off, 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 names either under different pseudonyms or through multiple entities acting in coordination under common direction.

Given the extensive and longstanding use of the Complainants’ famous mark worldwide, in an industry with significant public visibility, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainants’ rights. It would have required only the most minimal diligence to ascertain the Complainants’ rights. The pattern of

registering numerous domain names, within a short period of time, all clearly featuring the Complainants' mark, demonstrates a coordinated intent to target the Complainants and to exploit their reputation.

UDRP panels have consistently held that the mere registration of a domain name incorporating a well-known mark by an unaffiliated party can in itself give rise to a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The disputed domain names have also been used in ways that further confirm bad faith. A number of them resolved to websites mimicking the Complainants' official homepage, prominently displaying its trademarks and redirecting Internet users to an unrelated Telegram contact, in an attempt to improperly trade upon the Complainants' goodwill in order to mislead and deceive customers and Internet users in general.

The other disputed domain names resolved to inactive or parked pages.

The notoriety of the Complainants' mark, combined with the registration pattern identified above, renders it implausible that the Respondent registered and holds the disputed domain names for any legitimate purpose.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of some of the disputed domain names and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including impersonation and passing off, 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 names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 names <panavisionaduit.com>, <panavision-aka.com>, <panavision-aka.net>, <panavision-analysis.cfd>, <panavisionanalytic.com>, <panavision-audit.cfd>, <panavision-brand.cfd>, <panavision-grow.com>, <panavision-reviews.cfd>, <panavision.site>, <panavision-survey.cfd>, <panavision-1.cyou>, <panavision-2.cyou> be transferred to the Complainants.

*/Andrea Cappai/*

**Andrea Cappai**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 22, 2025