

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

beIN Media Group L.L.C. v. My Domains, misfit  
Case No. D2025-4650

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is beIN Media Group L.L.C., Qatar, represented by Tmark Conseils, France.

The Respondent is My Domains, misfit, United States of America.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <bein-tvs.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 10, 2025. On November 10, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 13, 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 17, 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 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 10, 2025. A third party sent an email to the Center for the fraudulent use of its mailing address for the registration of the disputed domain name on December 3, 2025. The Respondent did not file any Response. The Center notified the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment process on December 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Manuel Wegrostek as the sole panelist in this matter on December 18, 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 Qatari-registered media group and a globally renowned brand in the broadcasting and entertainment industry. Established in 2003 under the name Al Jazeera Sport, the group rebranded as beIN Sports in 2012 and has since become an international leader in sports and entertainment broadcasting. beIN Sports provides subscription-based television channels, websites, and mobile applications, broadcasting major sporting events and entertainment content across an extensive global footprint. Its operations span the Middle East and North Africa, Europe, Southeast Asia, Australasia, North America, and Türkiye.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for BEIN ("BEIN Trademark") and BEIN SPORT ("BEIN SPORT Trademark"), including:

- Moroccan Trademark Registration BEIN No. 97-142622, applied on February 7, 2012, in classes 9, 16, 35, 38 and 41;
- European Union Trademark Registration BEIN SPORT No. 010617082, registered on May 24, 2013, in classes 9, 16, 35, 38 and 41;
- European Union Trademark Registration BEIN No. 010617058, registered on June 15, 2012, in classes 9, 16, 35, 38 and 41;
- The African Intellectual Property Organization ("OAPI") Trademark Registration BEIN No. 1/081603, registered on February 27, 2015, in classes 9, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25 and 28.

The Complainant is also owner of various domain names including the BEIN Trademark and BEIN SPORT Trademark, such as the domain name <beinsports.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 10, 2025. The disputed domain name <bein-tvs.com> does not resolve to an active webpage but was used to send out emails imitating the Complainant.

#### **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.

On the first element of the Policy, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BEIN Trademark and the BEIN SPORT Trademark. The disputed domain name <bein-tvs.com> comprises the Complainant's BEIN Trademark in its entirety and as its leading element, as well as a variation of the Complainant's Trademark, namely BEIN SPORT. In the disputed domain name, the BEIN Trademark is followed by a hyphen and the generic term "tvs". The generic term "tvs" stands for "televisions". It is the plural form of "tv", which is short for television, a device used for viewing broadcasts, videos, and other media content. Therefore, this difference between the trademark and the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the opposite, the additional generic term "tvs" only exacerbates the likelihood of confusion between the signs at stake since the Complainant is a major

player in both sports broadcasting and entertainment media, offering a diverse range of content across TV channels and digital platforms.

On the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is neither a licensee of the Complainant nor affiliated with the Complainant in any way, and has no trademark rights in, or authorization to use, the BEIN Trademark or the BEIN SPORT Trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is also no indication on the Respondent's website of any relationship or connection with the Complainant. Moreover, the disputed domain name has been used for fraudulent purposes, namely, to send phishing emails impersonating the Complainant's employees and requesting urgent payment settlements.

On the third element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The BEIN and BEIN SPORT Trademarks are known worldwide and enjoy a strong reputation among consumers. Given the distinctiveness of the BEIN Trademark and the existence of an extensive family of domain names owned and used by the Complainant, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without being fully aware of the Complainant's prior trademark rights. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's famous BEIN trademark in its entirety and merely adds a hyphen as well as a generic term, which does not dispel confusion but instead reinforces the false impression of an association with the Complainant's media services. Although the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website, the passive holding of an almost identical domain name incorporating a famous trademark constitutes bad faith, as the Respondent is unable to make any legitimate use of it without infringing the Complainant's rights. In addition, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to send fraudulent emails.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, a third party sent an email to the Center reporting the unauthorized use of the third party's mailing address for the registration of the disputed domain name.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires that the Panel's decision be made "on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

It has been a consensus view in previous UDRP decisions that a respondent's default (i.e., failure to submit a response) would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true (see section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

The Complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the Complaint with respect to each disputed domain name, namely that:

- (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 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 applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant's BEIN Trademark in its entirety, with the only addition of a hyphen and the generic term "tvs". The disputed domain name is also a variation of the Complainant's trademark, namely BEIN SPORT. The Panel finds the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise), in this case "tvs", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BEIN Trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's distinctive BEIN Trademark with the addition of a hyphen and the term "tvs", carries a risk of implied affiliation or association with the Complainant.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to use the BEIN Trademark or the BEIN SPORT Trademark. The Panel finds that there are no indications on record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or otherwise has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Further, the disputed domain name is not used for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Moreover, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to create email addresses for email communications to clients of the Complainant that purported to be from the Complainant's employees.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 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.

Panels have moreover found the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark: (i) actual confusion, (ii) seeking to cause confusion (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, (iii) the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, (iv) redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer, (v) redirecting the domain name to the complainant's (or a competitor's) website, and (vi) absence of any conceivable good faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates the BEIN Trademark in its entirety and this trademark was registered years before the registration of the disputed domain name. Considering the distinctiveness and reputation of the well-known BEIN Trademark and BEIN SPORT Trademark, the clients of the Complainant that received the fraudulent emails, requesting urgent payment settlement, could easily be confused and think it might be from the Complainant. The email sent by the Respondent copies and displays the Complainant's BEIN Trademark in the signature of the email, and the email even lists the Complainant's actual website ("www.beinmediagroup.com") in the signature of the email, to make it seem like the emails sent are from the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally tried to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its BEIN Trademark and BEIN SPORT Trademark. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <bein-tvs.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Manuel Wegrostek/*

**Manuel Wegrostek**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 30, 2025