

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PT Go Online Destinations v. Malvino Rusli
Case No. D2025-3089

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PT Go Online Destinations, Indonesia, represented by K&K Advocates, Indonesia.

The Respondent is Malvino Rusli, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pegipegi.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 August 4, 2025. On August 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 4, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 5, 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 August 8, 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 August 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on September 8, 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 was established in 2011 and was the operator of the Indonesian online travel agency platform Pegipegi.com, which allowed users to book hotels, flights, and ground transportation. According to the Complainant, at its peak, the platform offered access to over 7,000 hotels, more than 20,000 flight routes, and over 1,600 train and airport rail links. The Complainant also provided a smartphone application for access to its platform.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of Indonesian trademark registrations for PEGIPEGI (the “PEGIPEGI Trademark”), including the following representative registrations:

- the Indonesian trademark PEGIPEGI with registration No. IDM000614171, registered on April 23, 2018, for services in International Class 39; and
- the Indonesian trademark PEGIPEGI.COM with registration No. IDM000614139, registered on April 23, 2018, for services in International Class 39.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 12, 2011. The Wayback Machine records¹ for it made in the period May 3, 2012² – December 9, 2023³ show that in this period the disputed domain name resolved to the Complainant’s Pegipegi.com travel agency platform. The records made in the period December 19, 2023⁴ – May 21, 2024⁵ display the message: “Hi, Loyal Pegipegi Customers! Almost 12 years of being your travel solution has been an irreplaceable experience for Pegipegi, but with a heavy heart, today, December 11, 2023, Pegipegi must say goodbye.” The record for February 22, 2025⁶ displays the following message: “pegipegi.com is available on GoDaddy Auctions. Get This Domain.” The record for March 11, 2025⁷ shows that at that time the disputed domain name resolved to an online gambling website. Before filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected to another third-party site. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name also redirected to an online gambling website. The disputed domain name currently redirects to another website, which is blocked.

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.

¹ Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”) section 4.8.

² “<https://web.archive.org/web/20120503212740/http://pegipegi.com/>”

³ “<https://web.archive.org/web/20231209115158/https://www.pegipegi.com/>”

⁴ “<https://web.archive.org/web/20231219020103/https://www.pegipegi.com/>”

⁵ “<https://web.archive.org/web/20240521012041/https://www.pegipegi.com/>”

⁶ “<https://web.archive.org/web/20250222012405/https://www.pegipegi.com/lander>”

⁷ “<https://web.archive.org/web/20250311114907/http://pegipegi.com/>”

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is identical to its PEGIPEGI trademark, because it reproduces the trademark in its entirety. The Complainant notes that the term “pegipegi” originates from the Indonesian word “pergi”, meaning “go” or “travel”, which reflects the Complainant’s online travel agency business.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it is not a licensee or affiliate of the Complainant, and the Parties have never had any commercial or contractual relationship. The Complainant adds that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name has taken place without the Complainant’s knowledge and consent and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant points out that the disputed domain name has redirected to illegal content such as gambling and has been used in a manner that exploits or seeks to capitalize on the Complainant’s PEGIPEGI trademark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not operating a genuine noncommercial website, but has used the disputed domain name to redirect to online gambling websites, which activity is illegal under Indonesian law⁸, which prohibits the distribution or facilitation of online gambling content and services and establishes criminal liability for such activities. According to the Complainant, the Respondent thus exploits the PEGIPEGI Trademark for illicit or misleading purposes.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It notes that the use of the disputed domain name for an online gambling website is a criminal offense under Indonesian law, and the Complainant has filed a report to the Indonesian police in this regard. The Complainant notes that, due to this violation, the competent Indonesian authority blocked access to the disputed domain name within Indonesia. Despite being blocked, on several occasions, gambling sites remained accessible when accessing the disputed domain name via VPN, indicating the Respondent’s intent to circumvent legal enforcement mechanisms.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent specifically targeted the Indonesian market in an attempt to exploit the reputation of the Complainant’s PEGIPEGI trademark, which is evident from the use of the Indonesian language on the website at the disputed domain name and the implementation of payment features that are only available in Indonesia. The Complainant maintains that as a result of the Respondent’s actions, the PEGIPEGI Trademark is being tarnished through association with illegal activity and deceptive redirection practices, potentially misleading consumers and eroding trust in the Complainant’s brand.

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.

⁸ See Articles 27(2) and 45(1) of the Indonesian Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions as amended by Law Number 1 of 2024, available at “<https://www.ministryoflawandhumanrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/9.pdf>”

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the PEGIPEGI Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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

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.

A respondent’s use of a complainant’s mark to redirect users (e.g., to a competing site) would not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s PEGIPEGI Trademark and had been used by the Complainant for its travel agency platform for eleven years. The evidence submitted by the Complainant and the Wayback Machine records for the disputed domain name show that in 2025 it started to redirect to different Indonesian-language online gambling websites as well as a third-party unrelated website whose names have no resemblance to the disputed domain name. The Complainant points out that online offering of gambling services is a criminal offense in Indonesia and this is supported by publicly available information about the relevant Indonesian law. The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has not provided any plausible explanation about the reasons for its acquisition of the disputed domain name and for its plans how to use it.

Considering the above, and in the absence of any allegation or evidence supporting a different conclusion, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in an attempt to exploit the goodwill of the PEGIPEGI Trademark, which cannot confer rights or legitimate interests in it.

The Panel therefore finds that 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. Other circumstances may also 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.

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 disputed domain name is identical to the distinctive PEGIPEGI trademark first registered in 2018 by the Complainant, and the Wayback Machine records show it was actively used by the Complainant for eleven years until the end of 2023. The changes in the content of the website at the disputed domain name as archived by the Wayback Machine support a conclusion that the Respondent must have obtained control over the disputed domain name only in 2025 and has mostly used it to redirect to Indonesian-language online gambling websites (with names completely unrelated to the disputed domain name), targeting the Indonesian market.

The Respondent has not denied the allegations and the evidence submitted by the Complainant and has not submitted any plausible explanation of its actions.

In view of the above, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that, by acquiring and using the disputed domain name, 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 PEGIPEGI Trademark as to the source or endorsement of such website. All this supports a finding of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <pegipegi.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: September 19, 2025