

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Silverstone Circuits Limited v. Silverstone Seats
Case No. D2025-2982

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Silverstone Circuits Limited, United Kingdom, internally represented.

The Respondent is Silverstone Seats, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <silverstoneSeats.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 25, 2025. On July 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 August 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on August 28, 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 operates the Silverstone Circuit, a motorsports venue in United Kingdom, known as the home of the Formula 1 British Grand Prix and the British round of the MotoGP series. Formerly a Royal Air Force bomber station, the Silverstone Circuit was first used by the Royal Automobile Club to host the inaugural British Grand Prix in 1948.

The Complainant operates its business under the SILVERSTONE brand, which is used to promote, host, and sell tickets to motor racing events, as well as to sell motor racing-related merchandise, vehicle parts, and various related services. It holds a trademark registration for this brand: United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00916661159 for SILVERSTONE, registered on February 3, 2020, in classes 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 20, 21, 27, and 35.

Additionally, the Complainant uses the domain name <silverstone.co.uk> (registered on March 17, 1996), which resolves to its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 9, 2025, and currently directs to a landing page that states, “The subscription has expired. We hope that you enjoyed our product. To continue using the website, please upgrade the subscription.”

Based on evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously directed visitors to an English website that allegedly sold tickets, premium experiences, and other packages related to the “FORMULA 1 SILVERSTONE 2025.”

On June 23, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asserts that it has met all the required elements under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Specifically, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name includes its SILVERSTONE mark, making it confusingly similar to its trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent lacks authorization to use the SILVERSTONE mark and has no relationship with the Complainant. Instead, the Respondent has been exploiting the Complainant’s goodwill for its own commercial gain. The disputed domain name has been used to sell unauthorized tickets and hospitality packages for the Complainant’s events, causing financial harm to individuals who purchased tickets and were turned away upon arrival.

Finally, the Complainant points out that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith just one month before its major event in July, the Formula 1 Qatar Airways British Grand Prix 2025, and has been used in bad faith to disrupt the market and profit by selling unauthorized tickets to this major event.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant has made the relevant assertions as required by the Policy and the dispute is properly within the scope of the Policy. The Panel has authority to decide the dispute examining the three elements in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into consideration all of the relevant evidence, annexed materials and allegations, and performing some limited independent research under the general powers of the Panel articulated, inter alia, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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, namely the SILVERSTONE mark. [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 "seats", may influence the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such a 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.

Therefore, 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 has verified through the WIPO Global Brand Database that the Respondent does not hold trademark rights for the term "Silverstone Seats," and nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent was commonly known by these terms when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel further concludes that the composition of the disputed domain name implies an affiliation with the Complainant and its trademark. Including the mark SILVERSTONE followed by the term "seats" creates the impression of being an official website for purchasing tickets or seats to the Complainant's SILVERSTONE

events. Panels have generally ruled that such a composition cannot qualify as fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Additionally, based on the evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name was registered and used for one month prior to the Formula 1 Qatar Airways British Grand Prix 2025 event to sell unauthorized or fake tickets for the event, which is an illegal activity that can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Therefore, 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.

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.

In this case, the Panel notes that, based on the Complainant's allegations, the Respondent has unlawfully used the disputed domain name to sell fake or unauthorized tickets to one of the Silverstone events, and the Respondent has not rebutted these allegations.

Panels have held that using a domain name for illegal activity, such as selling fake or unauthorized tickets, impersonation or passing off, or other forms of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Regarding the current apparent non-use of the disputed domain name, panels have determined that not using a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Furthermore, in this case, the use of the disputed domain name was temporary, limited to one month before a specific event, as this was sufficient time to offer and sell the illegal or unauthorized tickets for that event.

Therefore, after reviewing the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark within the motor events, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that, in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, 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 <silverstoneseats.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/

Reyes Campello Estebaranz

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2025