

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

RPI Print Inc. v. Edward Alan, Aamir Abbas, Usman KarachiWala  
Case No. D2025-4471

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is RPI Print Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by DLA Piper US LLP, United States.

The Respondents are Edward Alan, United States, Aamir Abbas, Pakistan, and Usman KarachiWala, United States.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <blurbpublisher.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain name <blurbpublishingco.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu.

The disputed domain name <blurbpublishing.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (individually and collectively, the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 30, 2025. On October 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 30, 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 Respondents (Withheld for Privacy ehf, DomainsByProxy.com, Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 3, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), 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 an amended Complaint on November 8, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. The Respondent Aamir Abbas sent an email communication to the Center on November 7, 2025. However, the Respondents did not file any formal Response. The Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on December 15, 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 has been providing publishing services since 1979, particularly in the area of self-publishing and printing services. The Complainant acquired Blurb, Inc. in 2020. Blurb, Inc. has been operating in the book publishing space under the brand BLURB since 2006. The Complainant continues to provide book publishing and printing services, computer software for designing books, consulting services in the publishing industry, online book retail services, and online chat rooms and message boards relating to the publication and printing of books under the BLURB trade mark. The Complainant's provides its services under the BLURB brand through its website at “[www.blurb.com](http://www.blurb.com)”.

The Complainant owns registered trade marks for BLURB in many countries including the following:

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 3493925 for BLURB registered on August 26, 2008;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 4984985 for BLURB registered on November 29, 2007; and
- Indian Trade Mark Registration No. 2109174 for BLURB registered on March 3, 2011.

(individually and collectively, the “Trade Mark”).

The Complainant uses the BLURB trade mark in a stylized form comprising the word BLURB in white within a pale blue book device (the “Logo”) in relation to its products and services. The Logo features prominently on the homepage of its website.

Prior to the filing of the Complaint, the Complainant contacted the webhost of the websites of the disputed domain names and succeeded in blocking all the disputed domain names so that they are all currently inactive. The disputed domain names (the “Domain Names”) and the websites they resolved to (the “Websites”) prior to the blocking are set out below:

No.	Domain Name	Creation Date	Registrant Alias No.	Registrar	Websites and Comments
1.	<blurbpublisher.com>	September 18, 2025	Alias 1	GoDaddy.com, LLC.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Banner at the top of its homepage which says that it is not affiliated with any similarly named publishing company, and that it operates independently.</li> <li>-Use of the Trade Mark and a logo which is almost identical to the Logo on the top left of each page of the Website.</li> <li>-Prominent contact form.</li> <li>-A chatbot at the bottom right of the home asking for the type of publishing related service of interest.</li> </ul>
2.	<blurbpublishingco.com>	September 10, 2025	Alias 2	Hosting Concepts B.V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Banner at the top of its homepage which says that it is not affiliated with Blurb.com and that it operates independently.</li> <li>-Use of the Trade Mark and a logo which is almost identical to the Logo on the top left of each page of the Website.</li> <li>-Prominent contact form</li> <li>-A similar chatbot to Website 1.</li> </ul>
3.	<blurbpublishing.com>	May 24, 2025	Alias 3	NameCheap Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Banner at the top of its homepage which says that it is not affiliated with any similarly named publishing company, and that it operates independently.</li> <li>-Use of the Trade Mark on top left of the home page of the Website.</li> <li>-Prominent contact form</li> <li>-A similar chatbot to Website 1.</li> </ul>

## 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 Domain Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark in which it has rights, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Domain Names, and that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant requests transfer of the Domain Names.

### B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. Respondent Alias 1 stated that he has ceased use of Domain Name 1, relinquished any interest in it, and will not contest the proceedings.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1. Preliminary Issues: Consolidation of 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 Domain Name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The 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 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following:

- (1) All the Domain Names comprise the Trade Mark as part of the Domain Names;
- (2) All the Domain Names were registered through the Registrar between May 24 to September 18, 2025;
- (3) All the Domain Names use the same webhost;
- (4) All the Domain Names are registered to addresses in the United States, although Domain Name 2, states as its address Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089, Pakistan when Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089 does correspond to a real place in the United States rather than Pakistan;
- (5) Domain Names 1 and 3 are registered to addresses in Texas, United States;
- (6) Domain Names 2 and 3 have Pakistan telephone numbers despite them ostensibly having addresses in the United States;
- (7) Each of the three Websites contains a disclaimer stating that it is not affiliated with Blurb.com or any similarly named publishing company, and that it operates independently;

- (8) The content of the three Websites have very similar content including the fact that they each have a prominent contact form and an identical chatbot in the right corner of the home page;
- (9) Websites 1 and 3 both prominently display a logo which is almost identical to the Logo;
- (10) The Respondents failed to file formal responses.

The evidence submitted points to the fact that all the Domain Names are subject of common control by the Respondents. The above pattern evidences common conduct based on the registration and use of the Domain Names and that such conduct interferes with the Trade Mark. The Respondents had the opportunity but did not respond to the Complaint. 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 Domain Name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

## **6.2 Substantive Issues**

### **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 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 entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the term “publisher”, “publishingco”, and “publishing” after the Trade Mark in the Domain Names may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names 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 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 Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the nature of the Domain Names is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant particularly since the additional terms are descriptive of the services provided by the Complainant. [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 it registered the Domain Names given the reputation of the Trade Mark. Further, the presence of the disclaimers on the Websites purporting to deny affiliation with the Complainant is evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Trade Mark when it registered the Domain Names. It is well established under the Policy that disclaimers are insufficient to cure an otherwise abusive domain name where the domain name itself is confusingly similar to the complainant's mark and is used to attract Internet users by creating an initial impression of association. In such circumstances, the disclaimer is typically encountered only after Internet users have already been drawn to the website as a result of the confusing domain name, and therefore does not negate the respondent's intent to trade on the goodwill of the complainant's mark.

The overall circumstances in this case point to the Respondent's bad faith. As such, the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith. In fact, the Respondent's use of the disclaimers is an admission by the Respondent that users may be confused. (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.7).

It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and the Trade Mark when it registered the Domain Names.

In the [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 three Domain Names without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The Domain Names fall into the category stated above and the Panel finds that the registration is in bad faith.

The Domain Names are also being used in bad faith. The unauthorised use of company/trading names which comprise the Complainant's Trade Mark as its most dominant feature, the use of the Trade Mark and a logo which is highly similar to the Logo on Websites 2 and 3 without authorisation are calculated to mislead Internet users to believe its affiliation with the Complainant.

The content of the Websites was calculated to give the impression they have been authorised by or connected to the Complainant when this is not the case. These Websites were set up to deliberately mislead Internet users that they are connected to, authorised by, or affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent employed the fame of the Trade Mark to mislead Internet users into visiting the Websites instead of the Complainant's. From the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to

attract, for commercial gain, by misleading Internet users into believing that the Websites and the services purportedly offered are those of or authorised or endorsed by the Complainant.

It is highly likely that Internet users, when typing the Domain Names into their browser or finding them through a search engine, would have been looking for a site operated by the Complainant rather than the Respondent. The Domain Names are likely to confuse Internet users trying to find the Complainant's official website. Such confusion will inevitably result due to the fact that all the Domain Names comprise the Trade Mark as their dominant elements.

The Panel therefore also concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are 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 Domain Names <blurbpublisher.com>, <blurbpublishingco.com>, and <blurbpublishing.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Karen Fong/*  
**Karen Fong**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 2, 2026