

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

National Hockey League v. Josh Forest, pixelpointmedia  
Case No. D2025-4001

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is National Hockey League, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Josh Forest, pixelpointmedia, Bangladesh.

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

The disputed domain name <nhlwebcast.com> is registered with eNom, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 30, 2025. On October 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 1, 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 October 6, 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 October 7, 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 October 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on November 11, 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 a premier professional hockey league operating since 1917. It is composed of 32 teams, 25 of which are located in the United States and seven in Canada. Teams within the National Hockey League compete annually for the opportunity to win the Stanley Cup championship trophy. The 2025 Stanley Cup final averaged an audience of 4.89 million television viewers per game in the United States and Canada. The Complainant's league is known under the brand "NHL". The "NHL" brand is registered as a trade mark in many countries including the following:

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 883569 for NHL registered on December 30, 1969;
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 4631182 for NHL registered on November 4, 2014;
- Canada Trade Mark Registration No. TMA460527 for NHL registered on July 26, 1996.

(individually and collectively, the "Trade Mark")

The Complainant also uses the Trade Mark in the form of a distinctive shield (the "Logo Mark"). The Logo Mark is also registered as a trade mark in many countries.

The Complainant's main website is at the domain name <nhl.com> (the "NHL Website"). The domain name was registered on October 18, 1994. The NHL Website received 62.3 million visits in March 2025.

A significant part of the Complainant's business is to offer telecasts and webcasts of live NHL games including through paid subscription streaming services. The NHL Website provides information to consumers on how to watch and stream the NHL games. The Complainant also owns the domain name <nhl.tv>. This domain name which was registered on October 8, 2001 resolves to a website where NHL games can be streamed on a paid subscription basis (the "NHL.tv Website"). The NHL.tv Website is available in Bangladesh.

The Respondent, who appears to be based in Bangladesh registered the disputed domain name on April 5, 2021. The disputed domain name resolved to a website that masquerades as the Complainant's official online platform for free live-streaming of NHL games (the "Website"). This includes prominently displaying the Trade Mark and the Logo Mark and reproducing the Complainant's black-and-grey colour scheme and overall look and feel. The Website also has a banner stating "NHL Network" and includes a footer disclaimer asserting that all NHL trade marks and logos "may not be used without permission". The Website further invites users to "[w]atch NHL streams online on any device" and to access "live or on-demand" hockey matches. In addition, the Website was used to host or provide access to pirated streams of NHL games without the Complainant's authorization or prior knowledge. An email server has also been configured on the disputed domain name.

#### **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 confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used 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 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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the word "webcast" after the Trade Mark may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the word does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant particularly since it includes the term "webcast" which is a direct reference to one of the main commercial activities of the Complainant thereby signaling an official source of NHL game streaming. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent must have been aware of the Trade Mark when he registered the disputed domain name given the reputation of the Trade Mark, which was registered long before the registration of the disputed domain name and the use of the Trade Mark and Logo on the Website. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when he registered the disputed domain name.

In [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

“Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant’s mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent’s claim not to have been aware of the complainant’s mark.”

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The disputed domain name falls into the category stated above and the Panel finds that registration is in bad faith. The addition of the word “webcast” after the Trade Mark further indicates that the Respondent had actual knowledge of and was targeting the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name particularly given that the Website was used to impersonate the Complainant and to provide access to pirated streams of NHL games.

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith. The Respondent’s unauthorised use of the Trade Mark, the Logo Mark, and the Complainant’s distinctive black-and-grey visual presentation, combined with the prominent “NHL Network” banner and purported copyright disclaimer, are clear indications that the Website was designed to mislead users for unlawful purposes. The Website prominently displayed the Complainant’s marks without any prominent and accurate disclosure of the lack of relationship between the Parties. Its overall content and presentation were calculated to give the false impression that it was operated by, connected to, or authorised by the Complainant. In fact, the Website impersonated the Complainant and provided access to pirated streams of NHL games, activity carried out wholly without the Complainant’s prior knowledge or permission. From these circumstances, the Panel concludes that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website and the services offered on it.

It is highly likely that Internet users typing the disputed domain name into their browser or encountering it through a search engine would expect to reach a site operated by the Complainant, not the Respondent. Given that the disputed domain name incorporates the Trade Mark in its entirety and pairs it with the term “webcast,” the disputed domain name is plainly likely to confuse users seeking the Complainant’s official website.

Further, based on the available record, the Panel notes that a mail server has been configured on the disputed domain name.

Section 3.4 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) states as follows:

“Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such purposes include sending email, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution. (In some

such cases, the respondent may host a copycat version of the complainant's website.) Many such cases involve the respondent's use of the domain name to send deceptive emails, e.g., to obtain sensitive or confidential personal information from prospective job applicants, or to solicit payment of fraudulent invoices by the complainant's actual or prospective customers."

Furthermore, although there is no evidence in the case file that the Respondent has actually sent phishing or fraudulent emails so far, the presence of an email server configured to the disputed domain name is an indicator that the disputed domain name could potentially be used to perpetuate phishing schemes and other email scams. Considering the circumstances, the Panel considers this further supports that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 <nhlwebcast.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Karen Fong/*

**Karen Fong**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 27, 2025