

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Club Atlético de Madrid S.A.D. v. ENTRADASMADRID LIMITED
Case No. D2025-2767

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Club Atlético de Madrid S.A.D., Spain, represented by Chanza Patentes y Marcas, SLP, Spain.

The Respondent is ENTRADASMADRID LIMITED, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <entradasatleticodemadrid.com> is registered with Mesh Digital Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint in Spanish was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 13, 2025. On July 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 15, 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 (DOMAINS BY PROXY, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 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 in English on July 21, 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 July 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O'Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on August 19, 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, Club Atlético de Madrid S.A.D., is one of the most well-known football (in Spanish “fútbol”) clubs in the world; owner of several trademark registrations that contain the term “ATLETICO DE MADRID”, including the following:

Spanish trademarks with the name CLUB ATLETICO DE MADRID:

Registration No. ES 0529777 (registered on April 1, 1967), Registration No. ES 0529778 (registered on April 1, 1967),

Spanish trademarks with the name ATM CLUB ATLETICO DE MADRID, S.A.D., Registration No. ES 2469875 (registered on October 16, 2002), Registration No. ES 2506880 (registered on September 16, 2003),

United Kingdom trademarks with the name ATLÉTICO DE MADRID 1903:

Registration No. UK00801218015 (Registered on May 15, 2017), Registration No. UK00916150609 (Registered on April 19, 2017), Registration No. UK00917081472 (registered on June 20, 2018), Registration No. UK00917108119 (registered on December 6, 2017),

European Union trademarks with the name ATLETICO DE MADRID 1903:

Registration No. 016150609 (registered on April 19, 2017), Registration No. 017108119 (December 6, 2017), Registration No. 017081472 (registered on June 20, 2018), Registration No. 018388555 (registered May 19, 2021), Registration No. 018898514 (registered on January 18, 2024),

International trademarks with the name ATLETICO DE MADRID 1903:

Registration No. 1218015 (registered on April 10, 2014), Registration No. 1438760 (registered on October 23, 2017).

The disputed domain name was registered on February 2, 2012, and resolves to a webpage that simulates the Complainant's webpage, which has an exclusive authorization from the Spanish government for the sale of tickets online in Spain. The Respondent's website replicated the design, layout, and functionality of the Complainant's official ticket sales portal.

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 was registered in bad faith with the purpose of intentionally redirecting visitors to a website that purportedly sells official football club tickets due to the following circumstances:

The term “entradas” means the offer and availability of tickets for access to matches in the tournaments in which the Spanish football club competes and participates, which regularly competes in the renowned Spanish La Liga and the Champions League.

Official tickets may only be sold through online channels authorized by the club itself or the tournament and competition organizers (LA LIGA, UEFA, FIFA) and their authorized official channels. Other unauthorized resale channels entail a higher price increase than the ticket prices offered.

Previously, on April 23, 2024, the authorized representative of the Complainant, filed a claim seeking withdrawal of access to the Google search engine for undue and unauthorized use of trademarks and image rights owned by the Complainant.

Annex no.14 to the Complaint provides evidence of the withdrawal of access to the location of the expression “ENTRADAS ATLETICO DE MADRID” in Google services.

The content of texts - mentions and names - and images of players and facilities, and colors imply a simulation of official status of the Complainant when visiting the content of the website associated with the disputed domain name (Annex no.13 to the Complaint).

Finally, the Complainant requests the Panel to issue a decision ordering the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

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 ATLETICO DE MADRID 1903 mark is recognizable 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 other terms here, the Spanish word “entradas” (which in English means “tickets”) 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.

The website at the disputed domain name does not contain any disclaimer that it is not affiliated with the Complainant. It only mentions: "Somos la web líder del mercado secundario de entradas. Los precios de las entradas pueden ser superiores o inferiores al valor nominal (We are the leading website in the secondary ticket market. Ticket prices may be higher or lower than face value)."

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Therefore, the use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered fair or legitimate.

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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's name and trademarks mentioned in Section 4 above when the disputed domain name was registered. (The first Spanish registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name).

In accordance with section 3.1.4 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Panel considers that the inclusion of the dominant part of the Complainant's ATLETICO DE MADRID 1903 trademark in the disputed domain name creates a presumption of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. The addition of the Spanish term "entradas" in the disputed domain name does nothing to diminish but rather tends to strengthen the confusion between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name, as it conveys the idea that the services involved are those rendered by the Complainant and that the website to which it resolves belongs to or is endorsed by the Complainant, which is false.

The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, has targeted the Complainant's business and its trademark ATLETICO DE MADRID 1903 with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant's trademark for its own benefit. Such intent is apparent when considering the commercial use to which the disputed domain name has been put, namely to confuse Internet users and make them think that the website to which the disputed domain resolves is owned or endorsed by the Complainant.

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name is also a significant factor to consider that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy and that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been fulfilled.

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 <entradasatleticodemadrid.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Miguel B. O'Farrell/

Miguel B. O'Farrell

Sole Panelist

Date: August 28, 2025