

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Netflix, Inc. v. Austin Stone, Resort Villas Andalucia, S.L.
Case No. D2025-2960

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Netflix, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Coates IP LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Austin Stone, Resort Villas Andalucia, S.L., Spain.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <scanlinesvfx.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 24, 2025. On July 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 25, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 28, 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 28, 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 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Mariia Koval as the sole panelist in this matter on August 26, 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, founded in 1977, is one of the world's leading entertainment service providers with over 302 million paid memberships in over 190 countries enjoying TV series, films and games across a wide variety of genres and languages. The Complainant is a pioneer in the delivery of streaming entertainment, launching its streaming service in 2007. Since this launch, the Complainant has developed an ecosystem for Internet-connected screens and has added increasing amount of content that enables customers to enjoy entertainment directly on their Internet-connected screens. The Complainant's streaming services were successful, leading to international expansion to countries throughout North and South America in 2010-2011, and then to Europe (the United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden) in 2012. In 2014, the Complainant expanded further into the European Union member countries such as Austria, Belgium, France, and Germany, ultimately surpassing 50 million total members. In 2016, the Complainant expanded its geographic scope even further, bringing its streaming services to more than 190 countries in over 30 languages around the world, including India, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia.

The Complainant owns United States Trademark Registration for SCANLINEVFX trademark (the "SCANLINEVFX Trademark"), No. 4259757, registered on December 18, 2012, in respect of goods and services in classes 9, 41 and 42.

The Complainant is active online and operates under the domain name <scanlinevfx.com>. The Complainant also operates on social media platforms, particularly LinkedIn and YouTube.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on March 3, 2025. As of the date of filing of the Complaint, and of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive website.

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 Complainant's SCANLINEVFX Trademark since the Disputed Domain Name comprises the Complainant's SCANLINEVFX Trademark in its entirety with the only difference being the addition of the letter "s" to the term "scanline."

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name in view of the following. The SCANLINEVFX Trademark is a coined term (i.e., fanciful) by the Complainant with no meaning other than to identify the Complainant's company and brand. The only reason why the Respondent would incorporate the SCANLINEVFX Trademark in the Disputed Domain Name is to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant's SCANLINEVFX Trademark. Furthermore, the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name and has acquired no trademark or service mark rights in the word "SCANLINEVFX".

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The Disputed Domain Name has been used to perpetuate fraud in a phishing scheme by using the email address "[...]@scanlinesvfx.com" by duping unsuspecting individuals into believing they are communicating with the Complainant and that they are sending payments related to invoices with the

Complainant. The Respondent is impersonating an employee of the Complainant with an email using confusingly similar Disputed Domain Name to the Complainant's SCANLINEVFX Trademark. The Respondent provides invoices to individuals using this fraudulent email using the Disputed Domain Name, as well as bank and payment information for these fraudulent invoices.

Moreover, the website under the Disputed Domain Name is inactive, being passively held, and therefore the Disputed Domain Name has not been used in connection with bona fide offerings of goods or services. Further, the Disputed Domain Name has been registered to exploit the fame of the SCANLINEVFX Trademark in a bid to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website or provide its email legitimacy. The Respondent cannot obtain or derive any rights or legitimate interests through its passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant to succeed must satisfy the panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Disputed Domain Name completely reproduces the Complainant's SCANLINEVFX Trademark with addition of the letter "s" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The Disputed Domain Name appears to be a typical example of typosquatting, i.e., a misspelling of the Complainant's SCANLINEVFX Trademark. According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9, a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. The Panel finds that addition of the letter "s" to the Disputed Domain Name in this case does not prevent the Disputed Domain Name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant's SCANLINEVFX Trademark.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SCANLINEVFX Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, 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 concludes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s SCANLINEVFX Trademark. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent’s right over the Disputed Domain Name under the Policy, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

There is also no evidence that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to offer bona fide goods and services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. On the contrary, as of the date of this Decision the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive website. Moreover, according to the evidence presented by the Complainant, the Respondent has used, and/or is using, the Disputed Domain Name for a fraudulent phishing scheme, whereby an email address created under the Disputed Domain Name “[...]@scanlinesvfx.com” was used to impersonate the Complainant. Through this deception, unsuspecting individuals were duped into believing they were corresponding with the Complainant in relation to legitimate business transactions. In particular, recipients were misled into making payments on the basis of falsified invoices that falsely appeared to originate from the Complainant. In pursuance of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1, “Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.” With respect to the circumstances of this case, the Panel considers that it is obvious that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with good awareness of the Complainant and with the sole intention of commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s SCANLINEVFX Trademark as to the source of the email communication sent using the Disputed Domain Name.

Also, given the typosquatting nature of the Disputed Domain Name, the construction of the Disputed Domain Name is likely to mislead or cause confusion, which was likely the main intent of the Respondent when registering the Disputed Domain Name, which cannot amount to fair use nor confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent.

Finally, the Respondent does not participate in this proceeding, respectively, the Respondent did not present any evidence for supporting any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

In view of the foregoing, 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 has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith in view of the following:

The Disputed Domain Name was registered long after the Complainant registered its SCANLINEVFX Trademark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's SCANLINEVFX Trademark in its entirety and resolves to the inactive website as at the date of this Decision. The Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name was/is being used by the Respondent for a fraudulent scheme. Evidence presented by the Complainant shows that the Respondent impersonated employee of the Complainant's company by an email address created under the Disputed Domain Name "[...]@scanlinesvfx.com" for sending fabricated invoices to unsuspecting individuals. Such conduct demonstrates a clear and deliberate attempt of the Respondent to exploit the Complainant's goodwill and reputation for unlawful financial gain, and constitutes compelling evidence of bad faith use of the Disputed Domain Name. In accordance with the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4, UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such purposes include sending email, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution (in some such cases, the respondent may host a copycat version of the complainant's website). Many such cases involve the respondent's use of the domain name to send deceptive emails, e.g., to obtain sensitive or confidential personal information from prospective job applicants, or to solicit payment of fraudulent invoices by the complainant's actual or prospective customers. Taking into account the above Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name, such behavior cannot be in any way considered as a good faith.

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 <scanlinesvfx.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mariia Koval/

Mariia Koval

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2025