

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Skyscanner Limited v. Blue Shield

Case No. D2025-3180

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Skyscanner Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Lewis Silkin LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Blue Shield, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <skyscannerlogistics.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 8, 2025. On August 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 12, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 14, 2025.

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 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 4, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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 is a company incorporated in the United Kingdom that operates a travel aggregator platform which offers users comparative pricing from different airlines, online travel agencies, and booking sites in a single platform. The Complainant's services are available in over thirty languages and in seventy currencies. The Complainant's main website, "www.skyscanner.net", was visited 41.6 million times in March 2025 alone, and is ranked 894th globally for Internet traffic.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for SKYSCANNER, including the following, as per trademark registration certificates submitted in Annex 2 to the Complaint:

- International trademark registration No. 1030086 for SKYSCANNER (word mark), registered on December 1, 2009, in classes 35, 39 and 42, designating amongst others European Union;
- International trademark registration No. 1133058 for SKYSCANNER (figurative mark), registered on August 16, 2012, in classes 35, 39 and 42;
- Canada trademark registration No. TMA786689 for SKYSCANNER (word mark), filed on December 2, 2009 and registered on January 10, 2011, in international classes 35, 39 and 42; and
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00002313916 for SKYSCANNER (word mark), filed on October 23, 2002, and registered on April 30, 2004, in international classes 35, 38 and 39.

The Complainant is also the owner, amongst others, of the domain name <skyscanner.net>, which was registered on July 3, 2002, and is used by the Complainant to provide its services under the trademark SKYSCANNER.

The disputed domain name <skyscannerlogistics.com> was registered on July 22, 2025, and resolves to a website promoting purported logistics and transportation services under the name "Skyscanner Logistics", which is displayed on the top of the home page, in the browser tab title and in the copyright line reading "©2025 All rights For Logistic. Designed By Skyscanner Logistics". The website also features the logo of a well-known airline as a favicon and throughout the website. The website appears to have been built using Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools and to be incomplete, as it includes template text in Latin characters in several pages and questions which are typically asked by AI when requesting assistance to draft texts, such as "It seems like you want help with a paragraph on the transport order process. Could you clarify the context or specific details" and "Ship and Logistics." When the Panel visited the website,¹ it displays the text "Could you clarify if you want me to write a new paragraph on this topic or if you'd like me to" in the "Services" page, and similar texts in the "About" page. The "Pricing Plan" section of the websites shows different plans which are all referred to "Aromatherapy Candles, Ture Transformation, Organic Essential Oils and Meditation Retreats". The staff featured on the website includes two people, who are presented as "Marketing Coordinator" and "Nursing Assistant". The website also includes a package tracking form and contact forms that users are requested to fulfill, providing their personal information, in order to contact the website administrator and obtain quotes.

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.

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 trademark SKYSCANNER in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the descriptive term "logistics", which could be understood as merely descriptive of the potential purpose of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves.

The Complainant states that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since: i) the Respondent does not own any registered rights in any trademarks which comprise part or all of the disputed domain name; ii) the term "skyscanner" is not descriptive in any way, nor does it have any generic, dictionary meaning; and iii) the Respondent has in no way been authorized to use the Complainant's marks in any way.

The Complainant also points out that the Respondent has directed the disputed domain name to an active website in an attempt to create "a thin veil of legitimacy" in order to create a defense against a possible complaint brought by the Complainant. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name is pointed to a website purporting to offer logistics services, as well as travel industry services under the heading of "People Transportation Services", displaying the SKYSCANNER mark and including the word "Skyscanner" as the visible browser tab title. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's website appears to have been configured quickly and without significant attention to detail, considering sections of the website are either placeholders, displayed in Latin, or completely irrelevant to the services supposedly offered including the listing of a nursing assistant as a key member of staff. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent's purported offering of logistics and travel industry services, use of imagery strongly associated with air travel and both the Complainant's trademark and another airline's logo are further evidence of its awareness of the Complainant's rights and demonstrate an intent to mislead visitors to the website.

The Complainant also highlights that the disputed domain name has been configured with active MX records, purportedly to communicate with Internet users in a misleading manner.

Lastly, the Complainant asserts that, in light of the nature of the word "logistics" combined with the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name, it is likely that visitors of the correspondent website or recipients of emails coming from email addresses containing the disputed domain name could expect to receive flight related logistics services associated with and/or authorized by the Complainant.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith registration, the Complainant indicates that, considering the disputed domain name was registered over 20 years after the Complainant acquired rights in the SKYSCANNER trademarks and the Complainant already enjoyed global fame in its trademarks, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

As to the use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant states that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is intentionally misrepresenting that it is connected with the Complainant, and it is therefore clear that the Respondent is seeking to profit illegitimately by creating a misleading link, in the eyes of Internet users, between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's rights.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent likely registered the disputed domain name to derive money from it, although the actual way in which it is seeking to do so is unclear. The Complainant states that the Respondent may intend to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant or a competitor, or may intend to set up a service in direct competition with the Complainant's, or pose as the Complainant in an attempt to

mislead Internet users for illicit gain, as suggested by the fact that the Respondent has set up MX records, which indicates a willingness to communicate with consumers under the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant concludes that, in the absence of any meaningful justification for the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-known mark, the Respondent's holding of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith use, especially since the Respondent has taken steps to mask its identity through a Whois privacy service.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been 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 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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for SKYSCANNER.

The Panel finds 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 term "logistics" 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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 notes 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 an affiliate or licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent obtained authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark or to register the disputed domain name.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent’s rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that, as highlighted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the SKYSCANNER mark and promoting logistics and transportation services, including in relation to air transport, but the website appears to have not been properly configured as it includes template and/or incomplete texts and information which is unrelated to the main services which the website appears to promote. Moreover, the use of the Complainant’s mark throughout the website and in the copyright notice, noting also that airline services are the services compared on the Complainant’s well-known SKYSCANNER platform, suggests that the Respondent intended to create an association between its website and the Complainant, inducing users to believe that the website was operated by a company having an affiliation with the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that such use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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 finds that the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name, confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, cannot amount to a mere coincidence. Indeed, considering the prior registration of the Complainant’s trademark SKYSCANNER in several jurisdictions and the use of the mark in connection with the widely known travel aggregator platform of the Complainant, the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The use of the SKYSCANNER mark throughout the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, which also promotes purported people transportation services, including air transportation services, suggests that the Respondent was very likely aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration.

The Panel also notes that though the website appears to be incomplete and, in many sections, undeveloped, the content and services promoted suggest the Respondent purposely registered the disputed domain name with the intent to mislead users into believing the website was somehow associated with the Complainant.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that, on balance of probabilities, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website and the services promoted therein, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

As a further circumstance evidencing bad faith, the configuration of MX records in connection with the disputed domain name gives rise to the suspicion that the Respondent may also have intended to use the disputed domain name to communicate with consumers. Under the circumstances, the Panel concurs with the Complainant that users receiving email communications from email addresses based on the disputed domain name would likely be misled into believing that they are dealing with an entity affiliated with, or authorized by, the Complainant, which is not the case.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <skyscannerlogistics.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2025