

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Malala Yousafzai, Extracurricular Productions, Inc. v. DNS Admin
Case No. D2025-3445

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Malala Yousafzai, Extracurricular Productions, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Richard J. Greenstone, United States.

The Respondent is DNS Admin, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <malalayousafzai.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 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 (“John Doe and Super Privacy Service LTD, c/o Dynadot”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 1, 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 September 5, 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 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 9, 2025.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on October 14, 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 Malala Yousafzai is a celebrated Pakistani woman residing in the United Kingdom. An activist for women's education and refugees, she was awarded the 2014 Nobel Peace Prize at age 17. Ms. Yousafzai is the author of five books, *I Am Malala: The Girl Who Stood Up for Education and Was Shot by the Taliban* (2013) (Young Reader's Edition with Patricia McCormick 2016); *Malala's Magic Pencil* (2017); *Malala: My Story of Standing Up for Girls' Rights* (2018); *We Are Displaced: My Journey and Stories from Refugee Girls Around the World* (2019); and *My Name Is Malala* (2022). Each of these books is currently sold in bookstores and online, including through Amazon.com. Ms. Yousafzai is also a film and television producer and serves as president of the Complainant Extracurricular Productions, Inc., a media production studio organized as a stock corporation under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States in 2021 and headquartered in Los Angeles, California, United States. Given their commonality of interests in this proceeding, the Panel refers hereafter to the Complainants collectively as "the Complainant" unless otherwise indicated.

The Complainant has no registered trademark but claims common law trademark protection for the personal name MALALA YOUSAFZAI for its use in commerce since January 2009, when Ms. Yousafzai began writing an online diary for BBC Urdu chronicling her life in the Swat Valley of Pakistan under the influence of the Taliban. This was also the subject of a two-part New York Times documentary in 2009, A. Ellick, "A Family's Journey and a Girl's Dream", New York Times: At War Blog (October 11, 2009). Although Ms. Yousafzai initially wrote under the pen name "Gul Makai", her identity as MALALA YOUSAFZAI was known by April 2009, as documented in her book *I Am Malala: The Girl Who Stood Up for Education and Was Shot by the Taliban* (2013), and she was nominated by Desmond Tutu for the International Children's Peace Prize in her own name in October 2011. She also spoke in Lahore, Pakistan in 2011, where she was recognized by the chief minister of Punjab and received a cash prize. Ms. Yousafzai received another cash award, the Pakistan National Youth Peace Prize, in November 2011 (this annual prize was later renamed after her). Thus, at age 14, before the initial registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant Ms. Yousafzai had gained wide public attention and earned more than the equivalent of USD 18,000 associated with her personal name for her advocacy and writing. Since then, the Complainant's personal name has been used in commerce with international attention in association with her writings, media productions (beginning with a commercial documentary titled *He Named Me Malala* (2015)), interviews and media appearances, as copiously documented in the record and in the Wikipedia article, "Malala Yousafzai". The Complainant operates an informational, advocacy, and fundraising website at "www.malala.org".

The disputed domain name was created on December 24, 2011, and is registered in the name of "DNS Admin", listing no organization, a postal address in the State of Wyoming, United States, and a contact email address from Name.ai. The Panel notes that "DNS Admin" is not the name of an individual or of a Wyoming legal entity. The postal address given, 30 N Gould St, Sheridan, Wyoming, is notorious as the address of an estimated 40% of the new limited liability companies incorporated in Wyoming over the past five years, many subsequently involved in consumer complaints, federal and state fraud investigations, and criminal indictments¹. The Respondent has not submitted a Response or replied to communications in this proceeding.

¹See, e.g., C. Pierce, "Wyoming Appears To Be in the Middle of an Economic Boom – of Corporate Malfeasance", *Esquire.com* (March 7, 2025); G. Lodewyk, "30 N. Gould St. businesses blur lines of what it means to be a Sheridan business", *Wyoming News.com* (November 29, 2024); L. Wolfson, "Are Wyoming's Secretive LLC Laws Making State A 'Haven For Scammers?'" , *CowboyStateDaily.com* (July 30, 2024); "'Virtual Wild West': Cybercriminals use Wyoming shell companies for global hacks", *KSL.com* (December 12, 2023). Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in this proceeding. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#)), section 4.8.

The disputed domain name resolves to a landing page with pay-per-click (“PPC”) advertising links. These links resolve to websites operated by third parties but lead from a variety of topics, some of which are clearly relevant to the Complainant, such as “Education Scholarships” and “Malala Yousafzai Advocacy Network”.

Screenshots from the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine show that the disputed domain name has resolved to landing pages offering the disputed domain name for sale over the years since the disputed domain name was created in 2011, with changes at times in the name of the web host or domain name broker. Such a change occurred after December 2024, when the Registrar changed and the landing page began featuring PPC advertising links, including links. The Panel concludes that the Respondent likely acquired the disputed domain name at the end of 2024 (noting that the current registration expires on December 24, 2025) or on March 20, 2025, when the Whois record was last updated. A screenshot from August 2025, attached to the Complaint, shows that the Respondent advertised the disputed domain name for sale through Dynadot for USD 45,000.

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 identical to the Complainant’s common law MALALA YOUSAFZAI mark and that the Respondent has no permission to use the mark, is not known by a corresponding name, and has not used the disputed domain name for any bona fide commercial offering or legitimate fair use.

The Complainant argues that Malala Yousafzai was internationally famous by the time the Respondent likely acquired the disputed domain name in 2025 and even when it was first created in 2011. The Complainant asserts that bad faith may be inferred from the Respondent’s attempt to sell the disputed domain name for USD 45,000 in August 2025, an amount in excess of registration fees, when the Respondent had no legitimate reason to use the disputed domain name itself.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy in the personal name MALALA YOUSAFZAI through use in commerce over a period of some 15 years. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.3, 1.5.2. The record shows that the Complainant has gained public attention internationally for advocacy attracting prizes and donations as well as commercial book publications and media productions. The Panel finds on this record that MALALA YOUSAFZAI is established as an unregistered mark for Policy purposes. (Indeed, a perusal of the record and of the Complainant’s website at “www.malala.org” suggests that the given name MALALA alone might also be accorded common law protection as distinctively associated with the Complainant).

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark 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. There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by a corresponding name, and the use of the disputed domain name for third-party PPC advertising unrelated to any dictionary or generic sense of the disputed domain name does not represent a bona fide offering of goods and services (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9).

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’s name had become celebrated and associated with writing and advocacy even by the time the disputed domain name was created in December 2011 and very well-known by the time the Respondent likely acquired the disputed domain name in 2024 or 2025. Thus, the Respondent was almost certainly aware of the Complainant’s mark in acquiring the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has used it only for PPC advertising and an attempt to sell it for USD 45,000. This conduct implies bad faith as described in two of the illustrative examples given in the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(i) (registration to sell the domain name to the trademark holder at a price in excess of out-of-pocket costs) and 4(b)(iv) (attempting to attract Internet users to another site for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark). The disputed domain name is uniquely composed of the Complainant’s uncommon name, and there is no evidence that the Respondent planned to publish a fan site, for example, or a critical commentary. The Respondent merely monetized the disputed domain name for PPC advertising, or allowed the Registrar to do so, and then offered to sell the disputed domain name for a large sum when, after 25 years of commercializing the name, there was but one likely legitimate purchaser, the mark holder. This must be deemed bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondent’s provision of incomplete, false, and suspicious registration details, as well as the Respondent’s failure to reply in this proceeding, further support the inference of bad faith in the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

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 <malalayousafzai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: October 28, 2025