

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Formula One Licensing B.V. v. Douwe Huijsman
Case No. D2025-2828

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Formula One Licensing B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Sheridans Solicitors, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Douwe Huijsman, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <f1holland.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 17, 2025. On July 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 21, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 24, 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 July 29, 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 31, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Richard C.K. van Oerle 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant belongs to a group of companies that organize FIA Formula One World Championship races, as well as other motorsports events. As such, the Complainant is the worldwide proprietor of the group's trademark portfolio relating to Formula One Championship races. The F1 Championship attracts a global audience of billions, is broadcast in over 180 countries, and enjoys a vast social media following.

The Complainant is the owner of many trademark registrations worldwide comprising of the word element F1, including, but not limited to, the Benelux trademark registration for F1 (word mark), with registration no. 1008618 and with a registration date of January 30, 2017, for goods and services in classes 4, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 25, 28, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 41, and the European Union trademark registration for F1 (word mark), with registration no. 009250721 and with a registration date of October 28, 2012, for goods and services in classes 9, 14, 16, 18, 25, 39, 41, 42, and 43 (together in singular also referred to as "the Trademark").

The disputed domain name was registered on July 4, 2025. The disputed domain name is currently inactive and its webpage displays "The website has been suspended". The Complainant has provided an undated screenshot of the website resolving from the disputed domain name, on which the core branding appears to be "MONAGP". The home page of the website, displaying "FORMULA 1 MONACO 2025", includes a banner for tickets, including Paddock Club tickets, and uses the same red, white and black color scheme as the Formula 1 official website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant became aware of this matter due to an issue which occurred at the 2025 British Grand Prix at Silverstone. A customer had purchased exclusive Paddock Club hospitality tickets from the website "www.silverstoneseats.com" ("Silverstone Seats" website), however it was discovered that the customer had been provided with fraudulent tickets and a fraudulent invoice, which had incorporated the Complainant's Trademark, including the official F1 logo and the F1 tickets logo. The Complainant conducted a review of this matter and discovered a related business "MonaGP" was referenced on the Silverstone Seats website under its Privacy Policy. Thereafter, the Complainant discovered the disputed domain name and its related website, trading as "MonaGP", as shown on the website and in the Respondent's logo found in the top-left hand corner of the website and which it is asserted to be a reference to the Monaco Grand Prix. The home page of the website includes a banner for tickets and is in the same red, white and black colorway as that of the Formula 1 companies. The offer of tickets for sale is a commercial venture for which no permission has been provided to the Respondent in respect of selling any tickets. It is asserted that the disputed domain name with its related website and Silverstone Seats are related businesses.

Given the serious nature of this matter and as it is asserted that both websites are fraudulent, the Complainant's representatives submitted a removal request for the infringing website found at the disputed domain name and consequently, the website resolved from the disputed domain name is currently suspended.

The Complainant further 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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark. The disputed domain name contains an identical reproduction of the Trademark. The word "holland" is descriptive and non-distinctive and acts as a location identifier and provides further association to the Complainant and the Dutch Grand Prix race. This term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, particularly given that the Complainant's Trademark is well known as per prior UDRP decisions.

The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name, which wholly incorporates its Trademark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation. The Respondent has no relationship or authorization from the Complainant to use the Trademark, and therefore cannot claim bona fide, noncommercial, or fair use. The associated website was used to offer tickets without authorization. Its branding, layout, and color scheme closely resemble those of the Complainant, creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source or sponsorship. Evidence further suggests that the Respondent may also operate other similar unauthorized websites under the name "MonaGP", reinforcing the commercial nature of the activity.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has hidden its identity behind a privacy shield, and provided incomplete details. Even though the site is currently inactive, the disputed domain name remains registered and may still be used, including for potentially fraudulent email purposes.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent's conduct demonstrates a deliberate attempt to mislead consumers for commercial gain, while depriving the Complainant of its ability to control its brand and online presence. Accordingly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

The use and registration of the disputed domain name incorporating the Trademark is an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, users to the website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, affiliation and/or endorsement of the website or of a product on the website. The F1 Championship and the Trademark enjoy a worldwide reputation, success and popularity. The registration of the disputed domain name is a deliberate and willful attempt by the Respondent to benefit from such success and in the process, to divert customers away from the Formula 1 companies and their authorized licensees, together with adversely affecting the Complainant's ability to sell tickets itself and through its race promoters and authorized third parties, circumventing revenue away from the legitimate sale of tickets.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Trademark without authorization from the Complainant and the Formula 1 companies, and in addition the website also incorporates the "GP" mark, which is well-known as the official abbreviation for "Grand Prix". Additionally, the Respondent's core branding on the website resolved at the disputed domain name appears to be "MonaGP", as shown on the website and in the Respondent's logo found in the top-left hand corner of the website and which it is asserted is a direct reference to the infamous Monaco Grand Prix. It would appear that the Respondent was purportedly selling general admission tickets and hospitality tickets (Paddock Club) to the 2025 Monaco Grand Prix. It is noted that at the time of filing this Complaint the Monaco Grand Prix has since ended, however, given that the disputed domain name includes reference to "holland" which hosted the Dutch Grand Prix in August 2025, there is a high likelihood that the Respondent will attempt to sell, or purportedly sell tickets for such Grand Prix race, and potentially others. There is a likelihood that the sale of tickets is fake and therefore, the activity is also fraudulent, further evidencing the Respondent's bad faith.

It is also noted that the Respondent provided an incomplete address when registering the disputed domain name, which further supports the assertion that the Respondent is engaged in fraudulent conduct. Additional examples of bad faith are noted as a result of the use of the Formula 1 companies' intellectual property rights which have been incorporated, without authorization within the website (in addition to the use of the Trademark within the disputed domain name). The use of the Complainant's intellectual property on the website at the disputed domain name signals that the Respondent is fully cognizant of the Complainant as part of the Formula 1 companies, its business and importantly, the F1 Championship race calendar.

It is evident on the fact of this matter, that the Respondent has registered a domain name which is identical to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity and is therefore evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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 other terms (here, the term "holland") 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 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 Complainant claims to be the owner of thousands of trademark registrations and pending applications in jurisdictions around the world for the marks F1, FORMULA 1, FORMULA ONE, GRAND PRIX, PADDOCK CLUB, and related design marks.

In addition to the F1 trademark, the Complainant also invokes the trademark GRAND PRIX and the Respondent's use of that designation on its website. However, the submitted Annex to the Complaint reveals that "GRAND PRIX" is not registered as such, but is always registered in connection with "F1". The website to which the disputed domain name directs uses "FORMULA 1" and "F1 GP MONACO".

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.

On the balance of probabilities, and certainly lacking a response, the Panel finds that given the notoriety of the Complainant's Trademark, the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant's rights in its Trademark, when registering the disputed domain name and subsequently using it for its website to which the disputed domain name resolved.

The use of the disputed domain name purportedly offering tickets under the name "MonaGP", and with a website layout reminiscent of the Complainant noting, notably, lack of any information as to the website's lack of relationship with the Complainant, cannot be qualified as a bona fide or fair use. The Respondent has sought to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page, or, as here, a suspended website) 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, the composition and previous use of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <f1holland.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Richard C.K. van Oerle/

Richard C.K. van Oerle

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2025