

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

JWS Trademarks LLC d/b/a SALXCO v. Edward Okene
Case No. D2025-4323

1. The Parties

The Complainant is JWS Trademarks LLC d/b/a SALXCO, United States of America (“U.S.”), represented by Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, U.S.

The Respondent is Edward Okene, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <salxcomanagement.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 22, 2025. On October 22, 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 Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) 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 29, 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 November 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Munir Suboh as the sole panelist in this matter on December 1, 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 JWS Trademarks LLC is the IP-holding company for SALXCO, a Canadian record label and artists and talent-management company. SALXCO was operated and led by music executive Wassim "Sal" Slaiby and operates as a subsidiary of and has been distributed through Universal Music Group's Republic Records since 2012.

SALXCO is an artist management firm operating both, within the U.S. and globally, and specializes in music management and copyright services.

The Complainant owns several U.S. trademark registrations for the mark SALXCO, including:

- U.S. Registration No. 6,762,531 for SALXCO (word mark), registered on June 14, 2022, in Class 35, with first use in commerce in February 2021.
- U.S. Registration No. 6,755,303 for SALXCO (word mark), registered on June 7, 2022, in Class 9, with first use in commerce in February 2021.
- U.S. Registration No. 7,000,425 for X SALXCO (stylised mark), registered on March 14, 2023, in Class 35, with first use in commerce in October 2021.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 8, 2024. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, the Complainant has provided evidence that it was used to send fraudulent emails.

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 it did not authorize the Respondent to make use of the Complainant's SALXCO trademarks.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to create a fraudulent email address and disseminate fraudulent contracts to third parties. Through the disputed domain name, the Respondent solicits and deceives third parties into purported "management" arrangements, and in furtherance of this scheme, transmits sham agreements, using the email address "[...]@salxcomanagement.com", that purport to bear the signature of the Complainant's Chief Executive Officer ("CEO"). The Complainant submits evidence to show that the Respondent has been using this email address to send fraudulent contracts to aspiring artists, purporting to be from SALXCO Management,

complete with a forged signature of the Complainant's CEO.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name entirely contains the SALXCO Mark, with the addition of the term "management" and the generic top level domain ".com".

The Complainant contends that the Respondent cannot demonstrate any legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's SALXCO Marks when it registered the disputed domain name, more than one year after the Complainant's registration for the SALXCO Mark in the U.S., and approximately three years after the Complainant's first use of the SALXCO Mark in commerce.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to succeed in an administrative proceeding:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- 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.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[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 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 Complainant owns several U.S. trademark registrations for its SALXCO trademarks for services related to artist management, with first use in commerce since February 2021.

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

The disputed domain name combines the Complainant's SALXCO mark with the generic term "management". Although the addition of the term "management" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such generic term to use the domain name for (management services) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 exists no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent that would give rise to any license, permission, or authorization by which the Respondent could own or use the disputed domain name that incorporates the Complainant’s SALXCO Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and as seen in the supporting evidence submitted by the Complainant, is using the disputed domain name to deceive Internet users into entering into fraudulent contractual agreements.

The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to create a fraudulent email address and disseminate fraudulent contracts to third parties, soliciting and deceiving third parties into purported “management” arrangements, and transmitting sham agreements using an email address that purport to bear the signature of the Complainant’s CEO.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including impersonation, passing off, and fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The evidence demonstrates that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to perpetrate a fraudulent scheme, sending fake management contracts to aspiring artists with forged signatures and demanding onboarding fees.

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 registered the disputed domain name on February 8, 2024, more than one year after the Complainant’s registration for the SALXCO Mark in the U.S., and approximately three years after the Complainant’s first use of the SALXCO Mark in commerce.

By intentionally creating confusion amongst Internet users, the Respondent exploits the goodwill associated with the Complainant’s SALXCO marks. Specifically, the Respondent uses the email address associated with the disputed domain name to bolster its fraudulent scheme, thus misrepresenting their true identity. This deceit combined by the distribution of fabricated contracts unlawfully bearing the signature of the Complainant’s CEO, increases the illusion of legitimacy and association with the Complainant, causing harm

to Internet users and the Complainant's business and goodwill.

The Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including impersonation, passing off, and fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name to perpetrate a fraudulent scheme, i.e. sending fake management contracts with forged CEO signatures and demanding payment, 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 name <salxcomanagement.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Munir Suboh/

Munir Suboh

Sole Panelist

Date: December 15, 2025