

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Skyscanner Limited v. John Parker, John Technologies  
Case No. D2025-2681

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Skyscanner Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Lewis Silkin LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is John Parker, John Technologies, United States of America ("United States").

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

The disputed domain name <bookskyscanner.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 8, 2025. On July 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 10, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Service by onamae.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 16, 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 the same date.

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 July 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder as the sole panelist in this matter on September 2, 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, Skyscanner Limited, is a company incorporated in the United Kingdom that operates as a travel aggregator platform, offering users comparative pricing from multiple airlines, online travel agencies, and booking sites in a single platform. The Complainant's services are available in over thirty languages and in seventy currencies. The Complainant's main website, "www.skyscanner.net" was visited 41.6 million times and is ranked 894th globally for internet traffic. The Complainant's mark SKYSCANNER has been registered in several countries and details of some of such registrations are as below:

- SKYSCANNER – International trademark Registration No. 900393, registered on March 3, 2006, in international class 35, 38, and 39.
- SKYSCANNER – Canadian Registration No. TMA786689, registered on January 10, 2011, in international class 35, 39, and 42.
- SKYSCANNER – Indian Registration No. 1890840, registered on December 2, 2009, in international class 35, 38, and 39.

The Complainant's main business website is "www.skyscanner.net", which has been registered since the year 2002.

The disputed domain name <bookskyscanner.com> was registered on June 26, 2025. Pursuant to a takedown request filed by the Complainant in July 2025 with the Registrar and Internet service provider, the disputed domain name is inactive. Presently, the disputed domain name does not resolve into any active website. But, it is worth noting that in the past, the Respondent's website mimicked the Complainant's website and provided identical travel information and arrangement services.

#### **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 is confusingly similar to the trademark of the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that it holds a global portfolio of registered trademarks for SKYSCANNER, and that numerous prior UDRP decisions have recognized the reputation associated with its mark. The Complainant lists out several registered trademarks from its portfolio to establish its right in the mark SKYSCANNER, with the first trademark registration dating back to the year 2006. The Complainant has stressed on its global reputation by highlighting that its website, "www.skyscanner.net", attracts tens of millions of unique visitors each month, while its Skyscanner mobile application has been downloaded more than 70 million times.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name and lacks a bona fide and noncommercial interest in the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is identical to its registered mark SKYSCANNER and that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates its mark SKYSCANNER. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's website closely mimicked its own, offering identical travel information and

booking services. The Complainant contends that this created a significant risk of consumer deception and potential identity theft, particularly as the Respondent had also configured Mail Exchange records and used the email address “[...]@bookskyscanner.com” in an attempt to defraud Internet users.

## **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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of the term “book” may bear on the 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 with 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, such as impersonation of the Complainant, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel is aware that presently the disputed domain name does not have any hosted content. However, the Panel finds that the Respondent's website in the past was aimed at impersonating the Complainant's authentic website by using the Complainant's SKYSCANNER mark and providing similar content related to travel information and arrangement services.

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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Respondent's conduct of using the Complainant's SKYSCANNER mark on its website for impersonating the Complainant with an attempt to defraud Internet users is evidence of bad faith. Particularly, the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the Respondent's website had provided the identical services related to travel booking and arrangement as the Complainant's website. The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name and was using the same, with an intent to pose as the Complainant's business in an attempt to deceive Internet consumers.

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 held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation of the Complainant, 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 <bookskyscanner.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Shwetasree Majumder/*

**Shwetasree Majumder**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 16, 2025