

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

NEXON Korea Corporation v. Jofra Ayden, Lacmag
Case No. D2025-2458

1. The Parties

The Complainant is NEXON Korea Corporation, Republic of Korea, represented by KAI International IP Law Firm, Republic of Korea.

The Respondent is Jofra Ayden, Lacmag, United States of America (“US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maplestoryplanet.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 23, 2025. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On June 25, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 25, 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 file an amendment to the Complaint.

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 July 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on August 13, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a large online game provider. Since its establishment in 1994, it has been engaged in the production, development and operation of various online and mobile games and game items including MapleStory, Dungeon & Fighter, Sudden Attack and KartRider. The Complainant has also moved into the finance market, including virtual currency and cryptocurrency. As a result, the Complainant is well known among users of PC games, mobile games, Virtual World games and cryptocurrency transactions worldwide. MapleStory is an online role-playing game. As of 2020, the game has reached over 180 million registered users worldwide and has grossed over USD 3 billion worldwide in lifetime revenue.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations worldwide MAPLESTORY, such as US trademark registration number 3,683,484, registered on September 15, 2009. The Complainant has also registered numerous domain names, such as <maplestory.com> (registered in 2000).

The Domain Name was registered on May 16, 2025. The Complainant documents that the Domain Name has resolved to a webpage that offers various services related to the MapleStory game, such as MapleStory game boosting services and MapleStory-related game devices. At the time of drafting the Decision, the Domain Name resolves to error page informing that “This Account has been suspended” and “Contact your hosting provider for more information”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that its trademark is well known.

The Complainant states that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark as the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in combination with the term “planet”. The Complainant states that the Domain Name is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the Respondent is in some way related to the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use and register its trademark. The Respondent and the Complainant are not related in any way.

Given the uniqueness and worldwide reach of the Complainant’s trademark and services, the Complainant believes the Respondent was aware of the trademark when it registered the Domain Name. This former knowledge is also evident from the Respondent’s use of the Domain Name. The use of the Domain Name gives the false impression that the Respondent’s website is operated by the Complainant or in some way associated with the Complainant. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith with the intention to sell it to the Complainant or a third-party buyer to obstruct the Complainant’s business or to deliberately lure Internet users to the website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark and business as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark MAPLESTORY. In this case, the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of "planet". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain; see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

The Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Respondent's use is evidence of bad faith, see below.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 Respondent knew of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. It follows from the fame of the Complainant, but also the use of the Domain Name. The use of the Domain Name is clear evidence of bad faith. The Panel finds that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, to drive Internet traffic to the Respondent's webpage by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. See paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 the Domain Name <maplestoryplanet.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: August 20, 2025