

Udemy, Inc. v. Virtual Real Estate Limited, John
Case No. D2025-4095

The Respondents are Virtual Real Estate Limited, Gibraltar, United Kingdom, and john, United States.

The disputed domain names <pu~~de~~my.com>, <u~~ad~~emy.com>, <u~~au~~de~~my~~.com>, <u~~ca~~d~~my~~.com>, <u~~cd~~emy.com>, <u~~de~~my~~cy~~.com>, <u~~de~~mdy.com>, <u~~de~~mhy.com>, <u~~de~~mn.com>, <u~~de~~mp.com>, <u~~de~~mya.com>, <u~~de~~myai.com>, <u~~de~~myh.com>, <u~~de~~myia.com>, <u~~de~~my6.com>, <u~~de~~my7.com>, <u~~de~~wmy.com>, <u~~de~~fyemy.com>, <u~~de~~imey.com>, <u~~de~~mei.com>, <u~~de~~wemy.com>, <u~~de~~fyemy.com>, <u~~de~~ndmy.com>, and <u~~de~~8de~~my~~.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 7, 2025. On October 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 10, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted For Privacy, Super Privacy Services LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 13, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed amended Complaints on October 14, and November 4, 2025. A third party sent an email communication to the Center on October 13, 2025. The Respondent Virtual Real Estate Limited sent an email communication to the Center on October 17, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 24, 2025. However, the Respondents did not file any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on November 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on November 28, 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 one of the leading online course providers, allowing users (businesses, professionals and students) access to over 260,000 courses for the purposes of e-learning. The Complainant was founded in 2010 and is headquartered in San Francisco, California, United States, and has offices in Denver, United States, Brazil, Ireland, and Türkiye.

The Complainant’s UDEMY service is available in 77 languages and has over 81 million learners utilizing its platform across more than 180 countries from its main website at “www.udemy.com”. The Complainant’s services have a global reach and it has an established social media presence under the UDEMY trademark including 8.4 million followers on Facebook, over 294,000 followers on X (formerly “Twitter”), and 3.5 million followers on Instagram.

The Complainant owns various marks registrations for its UDEMY brand including European Union trademark registration No. 011006319 registered on November 28, 2012.

The disputed domain names were all registered on May 14, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondent has used the disputed domain names <puemy.com>, <u8demy.com>, <uademy.com>, <udemn.com>, <udemy6.com>, <udemy7.com>, <udemyai.com>, <udemyh.com>, <udemya.com>, and <udewmy.com> to redirect to what appears to be a malicious website; and the disputed domain names <uademy.com>, <ucadmy.com>, <ucdemy.com>, <udemcy.com>, <udemdy.com>, <udemhy.com>, <udemn.com>, <udemya.com>, <udfemy.com>, <udimey.com>, <udmei.com>, <udwemy.com>, <ufdemy.com>, and <undmy.com> redirected to the same website but with a blank 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 names.

Firstly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark of the Complainant.

Secondly, the Complainant argues that the Respondents have neither rights nor legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Thirdly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions.

On October 13, 2025, a third party under the name O.H. (presumably on behalf of the Respondent) sent an email to the Center stating, "happy transfer all names but cancel the dispute".

On October 17, 2025, another email was sent to the Center from the Respondent Virtual Real Estate Limited using the name O.H. stating "Hi same owner does not use name can cancel this UDRP and transfer names. Regards".

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondents' failure to respond to the Complainant's contentions does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.3.

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following:

- all of the Disputed Domain Names were registered with the same Registrar;
- all of the Disputed Domain Names were registered on the same date (May 14, 2025);
- all of the disputed domain names share a similar lexical pattern, as they incorporate the UDEMY mark with minor spelling variations;

- the registrant of 23 out of 24 disputed domain names is john. Only the disputed domain name <udemya.com> was registered by Virtual Real Estate Limited;
- the Respondent Virtual Real Estate Limited sent an email to the Center confirming “same owner”, to which the Respondent john has not objected; and
- all of the disputed domain names are hosted on the same IP address (172.233.219.123) hosted by Linode, based in Chicago, United States.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive issue

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 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 UDEMY trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the UDEMY trademark. Each disputed domain name incorporates the UDEMY mark either in its entirety (e.g., <udemya.com>, <udemyai.com>, <udemmy6.com>) or with minor typographical variations (e.g., <uademy.com>, <udemhy.com>, <udfemy.com>, <u8demy.com>, and <udemmp.com>). These variations employ common typosquatting techniques - including letter substitution, transposition, and addition of numbers - while retaining the UDEMY mark as the dominant and immediately recognizable element. A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent was using the disputed domain names to redirect to what appears to be malicious websites. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity e.g. claimed distributing malware can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 has been using the trademark UDEMY since 2012; and
- The Respondent registered on the same day (May 14, 2025) the disputed domain names containing variations of the UDEMY trademark.

The Respondent has been engaged in typosquatting, as explained in Section 6.2.A of this Decision, given that at least 16 of the 24 disputed domain names are typosquatted versions of the UDEMY trademark.

The Panel notes that the respondent Virtual Real Estate Limited has been named as respondent in two previous UDRP proceedings (*Experian Information Solutions, Inc. v. Virtual Real Estate Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2491](#), and *Lululemon Athletica Canada Inc. v. Virtual Real Estate Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3604](#)). In both proceedings, the respective panels concluded that Virtual Real Estate Limited had engaged in bad faith registration and use of domain names in violation of the Policy. Of particular relevance, in *Lululemon Athletica Canada Inc. v. Virtual Real Estate Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3604](#), an individual who contacted the complainant on behalf of the respondent was the same person O.H., who sent an email to the Center in the present case on October 13, 2025, demonstrating a continuing pattern of conduct inconsistent with the requirements of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed redirection to websites containing malicious software constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Moreover, the Respondent has not submitted a formal Response in these proceedings and has failed to rebut the Complainant's contentions or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use. In the Panel's view, the circumstances of the case represent evidence of registration and use in bad faith of the disputed domain names.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 names <pudemy.com>, <uademy.com>, <uademy.com>, <ucadmy.com>, <ucdemy.com>, <udemcy.com>, <udemdy.com>, <udemhy.com>, <udemn.com>, <udemp.com>, <udemya.com>, <udemyai.com>, <udemyh.com>, <udemya.com>, <udem6.com>, <udem7.com>, <udewmy.com>, <udfemy.com>, <udimey.com>, <udmei.com>, <udwemy.com>, <ufdemy.com>, <undmy.com>, and <u8demy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: December 12, 2025.