

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Newcastle United Football Company Limited v. Mfcvxcrtnn Parsvdkerc
Case No. D2025-3205

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Newcastle United Football Company Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Gateley Legal, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Mfcvxcrtnn Parsvdkerc, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <newcastleunited-eu.shop> is registered with West263 International Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 11, 2025. On August 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 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) 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 amended Complaint on August 14, 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 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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 Newcastle United Football Company, an English professional association football club based in Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom.

The club competes in the Premier League, the top tier of English football. The formation of the club dates from 1892, when Newcastle East End absorbed the assets of Newcastle West End to become Newcastle United. The club has been a member of the Premier League and it has won four League titles.

The Complainant is the owner of an international portfolio of trademarks, including registrations for NEWCASTLE UNITED in the United Kingdom, European Union and the United States for a range of goods and services typical of a professional football club, such as the European Union registration No. 8285637 issued on December 1, 2009.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 15, 2025. The disputed domain name is not active.

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.

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.

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 term "eu" and a dash "-" 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 notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the recognized NEWCASTLE UNITED trademark of the Complainant, with the addition of the term “eu” (geographical reference for European Union). Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domain “.shop” may suggest a connection to the club’s official sales efforts in the European Union, leading users to erroneously believe this is an official or authorized website of the Complainant for commercializing products in the European market. In the absence of any Response, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name and benefiting from the fame and recognition of the Complainant’s registered trademark to attract web traffic improperly. Such conduct can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

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 Complainant has been using its name Newcastle United and its trademarks for more than a century;
- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 15, 2025;
- The Respondent is in default and has not given an explanation on why he or she registered the disputed domain name containing the Complainant trademark; and
- The disputed domain name is also not in use.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) 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 absence of any Response 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.

Finally, the registration data for the disputed domain name clearly demonstrates fraudulent intent through its nonsensical combination of character sets. The registrant information displays a jumbled mix of random Latin characters, creating an incoherent string that serves no legitimate identification purpose. This deliberate obfuscation of registrant details constitutes further evidence of bad faith registration intended to conceal the true identity of the registrant and indicates bad faith on behalf of the Respondent.

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 <newcastleunited-eu.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025.