

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WeWork Companies LLC v. DOMAIN ADMINISTRATOR, Buy this domain on Dan.com

Case No. D2025-4296

1. The Parties

The Complainant is WeWork Companies LLC, United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

The Respondent is DOMAIN ADMINISTRATOR, Buy this domain on Dan.com, Cayman Islands, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <weworkgo.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 October 20, 2025. On October 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 23, 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 ADMINISTRATOR, SUPER PRIVACY SERVICE LTD c/o DYNADOT) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 24, 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 27, 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on November 27, 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 United States company that provides shared workspace for freelancers, startup workers, small businesses, and large corporations promoted under the WEWORK brand since 2010. The Complainant has over 500 locations in more than 100 cities worldwide and maintains a strong social media presence across major platforms.

The Complainant holds extensive trademark rights in WEWORK in over 100 jurisdictions globally, including the International Registrations No. 1212432, 1212432A and 1212432B, registered on November 18, 2013.

On October 2, 2025, the Complainant has filed a WEWORK GO trademark application No. 99424919 in the United States, in respect of services in classes 35, 36 and 43.

The Complainant has operated the official domain name <wework.com> since October 3, 2010. The Complainant also has registered over 30 domain names incorporating its WEWORK trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 2, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint and as of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a "Domain for sale" page, where it is offered for immediate purchase at a price of USD 1,999.

5. Parties' Contentions

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:

- (1) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, since it incorporates the WEWORK mark in its entirety, and the addition of the generic term "go" and the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.
- (2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name years after the Complainant had established and widely used the WEWORK trademark. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has no license or authorization to use the WEWORK mark, and is not commonly known by "wework go". The disputed domain name resolves to a parked page offering the disputed domain name for sale for USD 1,999, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. Such conduct negates any claim of legitimate interest.
- (3) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered on October 2, 2025, the same day the Complainant publicly filed for trademark registration of "WEWORK GO", indicating opportunistic cybersquatting. Registering the disputed domain name so obviously connected to a well-known mark without authorization is itself evidence of bad faith. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name primarily for commercial gain by offering it for sale for USD 1,999. Passive holding combined with timing and knowledge of the Complainant's rights prevents the rightful trademark owner from using its mark and constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer the disputed domain name. In UDRP cases, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, the Complainant has to demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (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 Respondent was given proper notice of the Complaint and had the opportunity to respond. Under paragraph 5(a) of the Rules, the Respondent was required to submit its response within 20 days of commencement of the proceedings. The Respondent failed to do so.

Pursuant to paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the event of such a default, the Panel shall proceed to a decision based on the Complaint. However, the Respondent's default does not mean that the Complainant automatically prevails; the Complainant continues to bear the burden of proof on each element. The Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's silence, and, where appropriate, accept as true the reasonable allegations in the Complaint that are not contradicted by evidence.

The Panel has reviewed the entire case file and the evidence provided. The Panel is also guided, where pertinent, by the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), which reflects consensus positions of UDRP panels on many issues. The Panel will make reference to these consensus views in the analysis below as applicable.

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 mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its WEWORK mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's WEWORK mark in its entirety, with the only difference being the addition of the term "go". In accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8, addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the gTLD ".com" is required only for technical reasons and is generally ignored for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's mark to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not filed a Response and therefore has not rebutted the Complainant's case or provided any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests under the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has established rights in the WEWORK trademark and confirms that it has no business or other relationship with the Respondent. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its mark. Furthermore, there is nothing in the record to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or any corresponding name. The fact that the domain name is merely listed for sale reinforces that it is not being used as an identifier for any legitimate enterprise.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name is offered for sale for USD 1,999, and there is no indication that the Respondent is using it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Noting the composition of the disputed domain name and the timing of its registration, in the absence of any explanation by the Respondent for its choice of the domain name, the Panel infers that the Respondent most likely registered the disputed domain name with the primary intention to target the Complainant and its offering the disputed domain name for sale does not support a claim of rights or legitimate interests in the present case.

Because the Respondent has chosen not to participate in these proceedings, it has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 finds that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant is a well-known global flexible workspace provider headquartered in New York City, operating since 2010 under the WEWORK mark. It maintains more than 500 locations in over 100 cities worldwide and owns numerous trademark registrations for WEWORK in over 100 jurisdictions. The mark has been used extensively since 2010 and enjoys goodwill, supported by the Complainant's substantial online presence and marketing efforts.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 2, 2025, the exact day the Complainant filed a trademark application for WEWORK GO in the United States. Such timing is highly unlikely to be coincidental. Panels frequently treat registration that occurs immediately after the public announcement of a product launch or trademark filing as an indication of opportunistic bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1. Given the Complainant's reputation and the timing of the domain name registration, the Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights. The registration itself, mirroring the Complainant's trademark in full and adding the term "go" which, as combined, is the subject of the Complainant's pending trademark application filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the same day the domain name was registered, in the Panel's view, demonstrates targeting.

The disputed domain name resolves to a "Domain for sale" page, offering it for USD 1,999. This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, showing that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it for valuable consideration likely in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs. The immediate offering of the disputed domain name for sale suggests, on balance, that the Respondent sought to capitalize on the Complainant's existing and nascent trademark rights. Such conduct also disrupts the Complainant's business.

The Respondent has not provided any explanation for selecting the disputed domain name, and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its mark.

The disputed domain name incorporates the WEWORK mark in its entirety, merely adding the term "go". As noted above and under [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1, this composition together with the timing of registration strongly suggest deliberate targeting.

Considering the totality of circumstances, including the Complainant's long-standing use of its WEWORK trademark, the timing of registration, the Respondent's failure to deny any of the allegations, and the Panel's finding as to targeting of the Complainant's nascent trademark rights, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Accordingly, the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <weworkgo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/

Ganna Prokhorova

Sole Panelist

Date: December 11, 2025