

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Travelscape, LLC v. Kelly Partridge  
Case No. D2025-3418

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Travelscape, LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Kelly Partridge, Canada.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <travelocitz.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 25, 2025. On August 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 27, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 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 August 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 September 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Delia-Mihaela Belciu as the sole panelist in this matter on October 3, 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 founded in 1996 and is one of the leading providers of consumer-direct travel services for the leisure and business traveler.

The Complainant markets and distributes travel-related products and services directly to individuals using its TRAVELOCITY mark and its various brand websites and contact centers, being currently owned by Expedia, Inc. ("Expedia"), one of the world's largest travel companies.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations incorporating the mark TRAVELOCITY worldwide, among which:

- the Canadian national trademark No. TMA521262 for TRAVELOCITY, registered on January 11, 2000, for services in classes 35, 38, 39, 43;
- the Mexican national trademark No. 627618 for TRAVELOCITY, registered on September 30, 1999, for services in classes 38, 42;
- the Australian national trademark No. 805521 for TRAVELOCITY, registered on August 31, 1999, for services in classes 35, 39, 42;
- the European Union trademark No. 000163642 for TRAVELOCITY, registered on September 14, 2001, for goods and services in classes 9, 39.

The Complainant owns the domain name <travelocity.com>, registered on January 23, 1997, used in relation to a travel website which offers vacation packages as well as tour and cruise departures, online reservation capabilities for air, car, hotel, and vacation reservations, as well as access to a vast database of destination and other travel information.

The Complainant uses its TRAVELOCITY mark also on various social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter/X and operates mobile applications, including the Travelocity app available at "www.travelocity.com/app".

The Travelocity business and the related website "www.travelocity.com" have received or been nominated for several awards over the years, including the "World's Leading Travel Internet Site" for nine consecutive years from 1997 through 2006, the "World's Leading Online Travel Agency" (2013-2022), the "World's Leading Travel Booking Website" (2008-2012), and the United States' Leading Online Travel Agency (2021-2024).

The Complainant's "www.travelocity.com" website received on average over 5.1 million visits per month since November 2024, and is ranked 1586th in terms of websites visited in the U.S. and the 75th website in the tourism and travel category.

The disputed domain name <travelocitz.com> was registered on March 20, 2025, as per the WhoIs publicly available information, and it was used in relation to a website that redirected, according to the evidence filed by the Complainant in the file, to the Complainant's parent company Expedia's official "expedia.com" website, after going through an ad network.

At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage with pay-per-click links.

## **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:

(i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to his TRAVELOCITY trademark, as it contains the trademark in its entirety, with an intentional typographical error or misspelling that substitutes the letter "z" for the letter "y" in the mark;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name for a number of reasons, among which that, (1) the Complainant is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, (2) there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent giving rise to any license, permission, or other right by which the Respondent could own or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant's TRAVELOCITY mark, (3) there is no evidence showing the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use, as it is used in relation to a website that redirects to the Complainant's parent company Expedia's official expedia.com website, after going through an ad network, (4) registration of the disputed domain name incorporating entirely the TRAVELOCITY mark with a typo, mark used by the Complainant in relation to one of the most recognized online travel and booking companies and websites, in order to create confusion for the Internet users, registration intended in the Complainant's view, to capitalize on the hard-earned and valuable goodwill associated with the TRAVELOCITY mark;

(iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith for a number of reasons, among which that, (1) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name for commercial gain and to benefit from the goodwill and notoriety associated with Complainant's TRAVELOCITY mark, (2) the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's TRAVELOCITY mark with only a minor misspelling of a single letter, and was registered long after the Complainant registered the TRAVELOCITY mark, and its services became well-known, (3) the disputed domain name is used in relation to a website that redirects to the Complainant's parent company Expedia's official expedia.com website, misleading thus Internet users into thinking that they had reached Expedia's website directly via the disputed domain name, and allowing Respondent to gain unauthorized affiliation revenues.

### **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In order for the Complainant to succeed, it must prove, according to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In case all three elements above have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedy requested by the Complainant. Thus, the Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

## **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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's TRAVELOCITY trademark with a misspelling represented by the substitution of the letter "y" at the end of the mark with the the letter "z". Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark which is considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

In what concerns the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the name "Travelocitz", and is not affiliated with the Complainant, nor has the Complainant's authorization to use the TRAVELOCITY mark.

Moreover, the disputed domain name was used in relation to a website that redirected, according to the evidence available in the file, to the Complainant's parent company Expedia's official "www.expedia.com" website, after going through an ad network, which suggests that this webpage was designed to divert Internet users by creating the false impression that the Respondent's website is affiliated with or connected to the Complainant.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's TRAVELOCITY mark with a misspelling represented by the substitution of the letter "y" at the end of the mark with the letter "z", might lead to confusion for Internet users and as such, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

All the above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Based on the available record, the Panel 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's rights in the TRAVELOCITY mark predate the registration date of the disputed domain name by years.

In light of the above, and of the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that it is not conceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's TRAVELOCITY mark, which supports a finding of bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

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 the present case, the Panel notes that, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that redirected, according to the evidence available in the file, to the Complainant's parent company Expedia's official "www.expedia.com" website, after going through an ad network, designed thus to divert Internet users by creating the false impression that the Respondent's website is affiliated with or connected to the Complainant.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy and 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 <travelocitz.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Delia-Mihaela Belciu/*

**Delia-Mihaela Belciu**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 17, 2025