

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pink Floyd (2023) Limited v. Rosso Mando
Case No. D2025-3442

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Pink Floyd (2023) Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Boulton Wade Tennant, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Rosso Mando, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <morepinkfloyd.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 26, 2025. On August 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 28, 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) 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 29, 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 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac as the sole panelist in this matter on October 2, 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, Pink Floyd (2023) Limited, a company associated with the English rock band Pink Floyd formed in 1965 in England and has since released numerous studio albums, live albums, and singles. The band has sold over 250 million albums worldwide and has received numerous awards in several countries.

The Complainant owns many trademark registrations that consist of or contain the element “Pink Floyd” (the “PINK FLOYD trademark”) in numerous countries around the world, including, but not limited to the United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. 2066619 registered on October 18, 1996, in classes 9, 16, 25, 41, and the United States Trademark Registration No. 2194702 registered in October 13, 1998, in classes 9, 16, 25.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <pinkfloyd.com>.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on January 6, 2025. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a page containing pay-per-click (“PPC”) links to various third parties’ content related to the betting games.

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 as follows:

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark, in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the identical and distinctive PINK FLOYD trademark in its entirety. The Complainant further argues that the addition of the word “more” does not alter the overall impression of the Disputed Domain Name or prevent confusing similarity.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name or in the name contained within it. The Complainant states that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the PINK FLOYD trademark in any manner.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name and has no connection with the Complainant.

The Complainant notes that the Disputed Domain Name currently resolves to a Vietnamese-language betting website, which does not constitute bona fide use or legitimate use. The Complainant therefore contends that the Respondent’s use of the Disputed Domain Name is intended to target the Complainant and its rights and to create a misleading association with the Complainant.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the PINK FLOYD trademark in its entirety without authorization. The Complainant notes that its PINK FLOYD trademark has been used for decades and is instantly recognizable worldwide.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant's rights when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name to exploit the fame of the Complainant's mark and to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant further notes that the Disputed Domain Name currently resolves to a website displaying betting-related content, which has no legitimate connection with the Complainant. The Complainant argues that such use constitutes bad faith under the Policy, as it takes unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation for commercial gain. The Complainant also points out that the Respondent initially concealed its identity through a privacy service, which supports an inference of bad faith.

With the said arguments, the Complainant requests that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

Furthermore, the Disputed Domain Name consists of the Complainant's PINK FLOYD trademark together with the additional term "more". Where the Complainant's trademark is clearly recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name, such addition, whether descriptive, meaningless, or otherwise, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

In addition, the Panel determines that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the Disputed Domain Name is disregarded, as it is viewed as a technical necessity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 the 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.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists circumstances, in particular but without limitation, which, if found by the Panel to be proved, demonstrate the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, including:

- “(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

Regarding paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the Panel finds, in light of the Complainant’s asserted facts, that no license, permission or authorization in any kind to use the Complainant’s PINK FLOYD trademark has been granted to the Respondent. There is no evidence available that the Respondent holds any registered or unregistered trademark rights in any jurisdiction related to PINK FLOYD. Thus, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the PINK FLOYD trademark.

The Complainant presented evidence that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website displaying betting-related content in Vietnamese. As of the date of this Decision, the Panel confirms that the website contains material referring to betting services. In light of these findings, and in the absence of any evidence that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a legitimate business, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has capitalized on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s trademark. Operating a website displaying betting-related content using a well-known trademark to attract users does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

Regarding paragraphs 4(c)(ii) and 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, the Panel finds no evidence indicating that the Respondent, whether as an individual, business, or entity, is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. In fact, as it appears following the Complainant’s assertions and evidence with regard to the Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent had full knowledge of the PINK FLOYD trademark and had an intention to gain profit by riding on the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant.

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, including:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has put forth evidence that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant’s contentions and, therefore, did not refute the Complainant’s contentions.

The Panel has considered the Complainant’s assertions and evidence relating to the Respondent’s registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name. In this regard, the Panel finds that the Complainant’s PINK FLOYD trademark has been registered and put in use in, among other countries, United States where the Respondent resides. These registrations well predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Disputed Domain Name comprises the Complainant’s PINK FLOYD trademark in its entirety, adding only the term “more” in front. Given the worldwide famousness of the PINK FLOYD trademark and the band by the Complainant, which occurs in numerous countries, including in United States, where the Respondent resides, it is very unlikely that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in a fortuity. Also, in consideration of the use of the Disputed Domain Name and the content of the associated website, the Panel finds that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its well-known PINK FLOYD trademark when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel considers that such registration represents an attempt by the Respondent to take advantage of the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademark.

On the date of this Decision, the Panel accessed the Disputed Domain Name and finds that it still resolves to an active a website displaying betting-related content. In light of these findings, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website and derive income from click-through traffic by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s PINK FLOYD trademark, which is indicative of bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <morepinkfloyd.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac/

Pham Nghiem Xuan Bac

Sole Panelist

Date: October 16, 2025