

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

FuturLab Limited v. Bui Van Hieu
Case No. D2025-4598

1. The Parties

The Complainant is FuturLab Limited, United Kingdom (“UK”), represented by Sipara Limited, UK.

The Respondent is Bui Van Hieu, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <powerwashsimulator.shop> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 6, 2025. On November 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 11, 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 (Registrant of the domain name (tbc)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 11, 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 November 13, 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 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 4, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Indrek Eelmets as the sole panelist in this matter on December 10, 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 UK-based video game developer known for titles such as PowerWash Simulator, and the Velocity series. Founded in 2003, the Complainant has been active in the games industry for over 20 years. The Complainant has received multiple industry awards and nominations across UK and international games awards. As of March 2025, there were 17 million players of PowerWash Simulator across all gaming platforms.

The Complainant is the owner of the trademark POWER WASH SIMULATOR, which has been registered in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including the European Union and the United States of America (“United States”). Relevant registrations include:

- POWER WASH SIMULATOR (figurative) – European Union trademark registration No. 18229186, registered on August 25, 2020, in classes 9 and 41; and
- POWER WASH SIMULATOR (figurative) – United States trademark registration No. 6770540, registered on June 28, 2022, in classes 9 and 41.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 15, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to an active website that purports to be “the Official PowerWash Simulator store” and offers a range of merchandise inspired by the POWER WASH SIMULATOR game. The filed evidence shows that the products offered copy designs belonging to the Complainant.

The Complainant made multiple attempts to contact the Respondent, but such correspondence remained unanswered or was returned as undeliverable.

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 either identical (as it features the same words “power wash simulator”) or highly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks.

Further, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name resolves to a website selling merchandise that reproduces the Complainant’s copyrighted logos and designs without authorization, amounting to copyright infringement and the sale of counterfeit goods. The Complainant finds that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, which was only registered in 2025, and has made no effort to disclose any lack of affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent’s website falsely claims to be the official merchandise store for the Complainant’s game, thereby misleading consumers.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademark and is used to impersonate or suggest an association with the Complainant in order to attract Internet users for commercial gain. The Respondent’s website reinforces this false association through misleading language and the sale

of counterfeit merchandise bearing the Complainant's marks. The Complainant submits that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration, as evidenced by the copying of logos and imagery. Such conduct is said to disrupt the Complainant's business, damage its reputation, and create a likelihood of confusion.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name as the entirety of the textual components of the figurative mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 17 and 1.10.

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.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website purporting to be “the Official PowerWash Simulator store” and offers a range of merchandise using the POWER WASH SIMULATOR trademark without authorization. Such use cannot constitute bona fide offering of goods, nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.

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 trademark when he registered the disputed domain name given the trademark was registered and widely used prior to registration of the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has misappropriated the Complainant's trademark and images.

The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Therefore, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <powerwashsimulator.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Indrek Eelmets/

Indrek Eelmets

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025