

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Brett Liverman, megaparsonels  
Case No. D2025-3834

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL c/o Walters Law Group, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S.").

The Respondent is Brett Liverman, megaparsonels, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <megaprsonals.com> is registered with Purple IT Ltd (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 19, 2025. On September 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 3, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 3, 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 October 3, 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 October 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on October 31, 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, Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL, provides Internet-based social introduction and dating services under its MEGAPERSONALS mark from its website hosted at its domain name <megapersonals.eu>. The Complainant also owns the domain name <megapersonals.com> which redirects to the website at the domain name <megapersonals.eu>.

The Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS trade mark is registered under United States trade Mark Registration No. 6432591 in Class 45, having a registration date of July 27, 2021, and a first use in commerce date of March 30, 2004.

The Complainant also asserts that its trademark rights have been recognized in numerous UDRP proceedings (see *Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Mohd Khan*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4010](#); *Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL c/o Walters Law Group v. DomainAdministrator d/b/a privacy.cloudns.net, Cloud DNS Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2023-0026](#)).

The disputed domain name <megapersonals.com> was registered on June 11, 2025. The evidence provided by the Complainant indicates that at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that featured the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS trade mark and required an email address and password to log in. At the time of issuance of this Decision, the disputed domain name continues to resolve to the same page.

#### **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 registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS trade marks, as the Respondent has merely removed the letter "e" in "personals", and that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not affect the analysis as to whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade marks.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the MEGAPERSONALS marks, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or has undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain name has been used to phish for login credentials of the Complainant's clients.

The Complainant also claims there is no evidence that the Respondent has any connection to the MEGAPERSONALS marks, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name must be in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is widely accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned and 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 Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the MEGAPERSONALS trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Disregarding the gTLD ".com", the Panel finds the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, despite the omission of one letter. 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.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing their rights in the MEGAPERSONALS trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their mark.

### **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.

There is no evidence to show that the Respondent, prior to the notice of the dispute, had used or demonstrated its preparation to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is also no evidence to show that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file a response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. As such, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing of the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that none of the circumstances of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy is applicable in this case.

Accordingly, and based on the Panel's findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its 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 the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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).

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

When the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the MEGAPERSONALS trade mark was already widely known and directly associated with the Complainant's activities. The Complainant's registered trade mark rights in MEGAPERSONALS for its products and services predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. A simple online search for the term "megapersonals" would have revealed that it is an established brand.

Moreover, the disputed domain name involves typosquatting by removing the second letter "e" in the MEGAPERSONALS trade mark, and resolves to a website displaying an identical copy of the Complainant's mark and logo and requires an email address and password to log in. This demonstrates the Respondent's intent to create confusion among Internet users who may fail to notice the slight difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark, and to obtain confidential user information such as login credentials which constitutes bad faith. Thus, the Respondent must have known of the Complainant's mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2. UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trade mark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) 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 <megaprsonals.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Joseph Simone/*

**Joseph Simone**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 13, 2025