

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

JBMG Limited v. web master, jbmj inc  
Case No. D2025-2543

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is JBMG Limited, United Kingdom, represented internally.

The Respondent is web master, jbmj inc, Japan.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

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

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 30, 2025. On June 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 30, 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 CONTACT) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 1, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 1, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 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 a specialist marketing agency based in London, United Kingdom, and operating in the music industry globally. It claims to have executed campaigns for leading clients including Universal Music Group, Sony Music, Virgin Music Artist & Label Services, Ninja Tune, The Orchard, and JD Fashion PLC.

According to the information available on the website of the United Kingdom Companies House,<sup>1</sup> the Complainant was incorporated on January 17, 2024, and its director and person with significant control was born in November 2001.

The Complainant is the owner of the United Kingdom trademark JBMG (the “JBMG trademark”) with registration No. UK00004153322, filed on January 28, 2025 and registered on April 18, 2025, for services in International Class 35.

The only information about the Respondent is the information provided by the Registrar, which includes the organization name “jbmg inc”.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 15, 2003. As of the date of filing of the Complaint and as of the date of the present decision, it resolves to a landing webpage that offers it for sale with text, including:

“Domain name (you type) is for sale  
- Limited offer USD7980 -  
(This price is strictly non negotiable. We will not reply to a lower bid.)  
with Escrow.com Escrow process”

#### 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.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is identical to its JBMG trademark.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it resolves to a static landing webpage offering the disputed domain name for sale. The Complainant notes that the website at the disputed domain name contains no content indicative of a legitimate business or good faith use. According to the Complainant, the offer to sell alone, without any associated business or offering, is insufficient to confer rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant submits that the landing page at the disputed domain name includes the placeholder syntax “(you type)”, which is an indication of automated or bulk registration or domain names aimed at acquiring acronym-based domain names without intent to use them for legitimate purposes, which practice according to the Complainant fails to establish any rights or legitimate interests. The Complainant adds that there is no evidence that the Respondent is or has ever been commonly known by the name “jbmg”, that the disputed domain name is not being used for criticism, parody, commentary, or other forms of fair use, and that the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use the JBMG trademark or to register a domain name containing it.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/company/15421840>

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It submits that the disputed domain name is listed for USD 7,980, which according to it is a price far beyond any plausible registration or maintenance cost. The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name is registered with the Registrar, which is known for supporting domain name resellers, and points out that the Registrar's website states: "Enom is 100% focused on supporting our reseller partners. We provide you everything you need to sell domains [...]". According to the Complainant, this supports the inference that the disputed domain name was registered with resale, not use, in mind, and registering a domain name primarily for the purpose of resale to the rights holder or to third parties can constitute 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 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 the JBMG trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. As noted in section 4 above, the JBMG trademark was registered on April 18, 2025. This is 22 years after the registration of the disputed domain name in 2003, but this fact does not by itself preclude the Complainant's standing to file a UDRP case, nor a panel's finding of identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.1.3.

The entirety of the JBMG trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the JBMG trademark 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**

Since the Complainant has failed to establish the third element of the Policy, there is no need to address this element.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The disputed domain name was registered in 2003. The Complainant was established in 2024 and registered the JBMG trademark in 2025, and its director and person with significant control was born in 2001. In this situation, the Respondent could not have known of the then non-existent business of the Complainant in 2003, when it registered the disputed domain name. There is also no evidence in the case to suggest that at any point in time the Respondent has somehow targeted the Complainant and its trademark through its use of the disputed domain name.

Considering the above, the Complainant has failed to establish that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith targeting of the Complainant or its trademark rights.

Therefore, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Assen Alexiev/*

**Assen Alexiev**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2025