

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

X Holidays Limited v. Obaid Albloushi

Case No. D2025-4717

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is X Holidays Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), internally represented.

The Respondent is Obaid Albloushi, United Arab Emirates ("UAE").

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <xholidays.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 14, 2025. On November 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 14, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent a Complaint Deficiency Notice to the Complainant on November 17, 2025, which sent an amended Complaint on the same day. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 17, 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 email stating it did not want to amend to the Complaint on November 17, 2025.

The Center verified that the 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 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 8, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 7, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Complainant sent an unsolicited supplemental filing.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 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-incorporated online travel agency and booking platform trading under the X-HOLIDAYS mark. Its company name was changed to “X Holidays Limited” on November 6, 2023. The Complainant’s website is hosted at its domain name <x-holidays.com> which was registered in 2022. The Complainant owns UK Trademark Registration No. UK00004133198 for the series of marks X-HOLIDAYS, XHOLIDAYS, and XHOLIDAY, in classes 35, 39, and 43, having a registration date of March 7, 2025.

The Respondent is a UAE based entrepreneur that operates several businesses incorporated and licensed to trade in Dubai, including:

- X Hub Technologies L.L.C. – IT and infrastructure services
- X Dynamics FZE – digital, software and technology projects
- E X Holidays Travel and Tourism L.L.C., trading as “X Holidays” – a travel agency

The disputed domain name was registered on May 7, 2009, and acquired by the Respondent in February 2025. The evidence in the record shows that it previously resolved to a website for a travel agency trading as “X Holidays”. On November 18, 2025, it resolved to a template ecommerce website without any substantive content. Presently, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website.

#### **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 was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant’s mark to benefit commercially the Respondent’s competing travel agency.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent contends that he registered and has used the disputed domain name in good faith for a bona fide travel agency business without any intention of targeting the Complainant. The Respondent contends that the disputed domain name (which corresponds to the trading name of his travel agency) is part of a family of X-incorporating business names (as set out in the Factual Background section above) and was chosen for this reason. He also contends that he is based in Dubai and does not compete with the Complainant, who is based in the UK and who targets mass-market travel bookings as opposed to the Respondent’s offering which focusses on individual relationships with wealthy UAE-based clients.

The Respondent requests that the complaint be denied and a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (“RDNH”).

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Complainant's Supplemental Filing**

The Complainant filed an unsolicited Supplemental Filing on December 8, 2025.

Paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules grant the Panel sole discretion to determine the admissibility of unsolicited supplemental filings. Admissibility of supplemental filings is to be assessed based on relevance, foreseeability, the need to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, and the equal treatment of the parties so that each has a fair opportunity to present its case. Paragraph 10(b) of the Rules; *Société aux Loteries en Europe, SLE v. Take That Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0214](#); WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.6.

The Response contained details of the Respondent's other businesses and his business history which the Complainant could not have anticipated. The Response also contained an allegation of RDNH, and the Panel agrees with the statement made by the Panel in *Cosmos European Travels AG v. Eurotech Data Systems Hellos, Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0941](#) to the effect that a complainant facing an allegation of RDNH is “entitled to defend itself”. To this extent, the Panel admits the Complainant's Supplemental Filing.

### **B. 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 entirety of the Complainant's XHOLIDAYS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Given the Panel's findings in relation to the third element, there is no need for the Panel to consider the second element.

### **D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that the evidence in the record is insufficient, on balance of probabilities, to sustain the Complainant's claims of bad faith targeting.

The Complainant claims goodwill in its X-HOLIDAYS mark and asserts that the Respondent has attempted to trade on this goodwill. The Complainant does not, however, provide any evidence showing that its mark enjoyed any goodwill or a reputation when the disputed domain name was registered or first used by the Respondent.

The Respondent appears to have acquired the disputed domain name in February 2025, which is before the Complainant's mark was registered. The Complainant does not state when it first began using its mark. Based on its general powers articulated *inter alia* in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has independently viewed the Internet Archive records for the Complainant's website. It was first archived in April 2024, but the records are inconclusive as to when the Complainant's website first went live – all of the

archived results simply show a “403 Forbidden” error. The Complainant’s company underwent a name change to its current name in November 2023, yet this does not establish when the Complainant first began actually using its mark in trade. The Complainant’s [x-holidays.com](http://x-holidays.com) domain name was registered in 2022, yet without more this too does not establish when the Complainant’s mark was first used. There is therefore no evidence in the record showing when the Complainant first began using its mark. Importantly, this means that it is not clear from the record whether the Complainant had used its mark at all prior to registration and first use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, let alone whether the mark enjoyed any reputation or goodwill that the Respondent might have sought to take advantage of.

The Respondent is based in the UAE and there is no evidence in the record showing any exposure of the Complainant’s mark or trade by the Complainant in the UAE, which might have brought the Complainant’s mark to the Respondent’s attention.

Apart from the similarities between the names of the parties’ respective travel agencies, there are no obvious indicators of targeting apparent on the Respondent’s erstwhile websites, which were very different to that of the Complainant, including its logo, imagery, text, and general look and feel. The Panel has also not been able to find any history of cybersquatting on the Respondent’s part.

The Complainant’s mark is not particularly distinctive inherently, consisting as it does of a commonplace letter of the Latin alphabet plus the descriptive term “holidays”. It is therefore not inconceivable that a third party might have independently conceived of the disputed domain name without any intention of targeting the Complainant. This is borne out by the fact that the Panel’s cursory Internet searches revealed at least one other travel agency using a highly similar name e.g., “xholidayindia”.

In the circumstances, bearing in mind that the burden of proof is on the Complainant, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

## **E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

The Respondent requested a finding of RDNH.

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at RDNH or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute RDNH. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.16.

The Complainant is unrepresented, it being accepted that represented complainants are held to a higher standard than unrepresented ones (*Sixsigma Network s Mexico, S.A. DE C.V. v. DYNAMO.COM AUTORENEWAL AND DNS*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4534](#)).

The Complainant filed its trade mark application, and its domain name was registered and company name changed, prior to registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent. Although this is insufficient, on balance of probabilities, to establish goodwill or a reputation in the Complainant’s hands or the date of first use of the Complainant’s mark, it is at least suggestive of a first use date prior to registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent. The parties also trade in the same industry.

This all suggests that it was not entirely unreasonable of the Complainant to bring the Complaint, and that it is possible that the Complainant genuinely believed this to be a case of cybersquatting. It failed, however, to present sufficient evidence to support its case.

On balance of probabilities, the Panel does not consider it more likely than not that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, and the Panel declines to find RDNH.

**7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

*/Jeremy Speres/*

**Jeremy Speres**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 29, 2025