

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Blood Cancer United, Inc. f/k/a The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, Inc. v.
Tina York, Charming74
Case No. D2025-4730

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Blood Cancer United, Inc. f/k/a The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, Inc., United States of America, represented by Venable, LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Tina York, Charming74, United States of America, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lightthenight.live> 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, against Dalton S. York and Tina York. On November 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 17, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name (Tina York, Charming74) which differed from the named Respondent in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 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 amendment to the Complaint on November 25, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was December 22, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 22, 2025. The Respondent also sent numerous emails to the Center between November 17 and December 16, 2025.

The Center appointed David H. Bernstein as the sole panelist in this matter on December 30, 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.

Following appointment of the Panel, the Respondent submitted several unsolicited supplemental filings. On December 31, 2025, the Respondent submitted a filing in which she raised questions about the impartiality of the Panelist and demanded termination of the proceedings. The Respondent then submitted additional filings on January 4, 2026, and January 5, 2026, challenging the Complainant's standing under the UDRP and raising additional arguments in support of the Response. The Respondent submitted another filing on January 7, 2026, accusing the Complainant's counsel of bad faith and misconduct. On January 9, 2026, the Complainant submitted a response objecting to the Respondent's submissions and denying all allegations of wrongdoing. Later that same day, the Respondent submitted another filing restating the allegations raised in prior filings.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Blood Cancer United, Inc., formerly known as the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society, Inc., is a New York non-profit corporation, founded in 1949. The Complainant states that it has invested more than USD 1.8 billion in advances in cancer medicine and maintains a nationwide network of more than 100,000 volunteers who advocate for policies that benefit cancer patients. For more than 25 years, the Complainant has organized and conducted its flagship "Light The Night" events to raise funds for and awareness of cancer, and to allow participants to honor those who have been affected by the disease. The Complainant states that its Light the Night events, at which participants carry and lift illuminated lanterns into the air, have raised more than USD 1 billion in support of the Complainant's mission.

The Complainant owns U.S. Trademark Registration No. 2,266,963 for LIGHT THE NIGHT, in connection with charitable fund raising for leukemia research, patient aid and public and professional education, which it registered in 1999 (the "LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark"). The Complainant also owns U.S. Registration Nos. 5,889,778, 5,889,783, and 5,884,249, which were registered in 2019, and U.S. Registration Nos. 5,531,343 and 5,531,342, which were registered in 2018. Each of those registrations includes LIGHT THE NIGHT (sometimes with other words or design elements). The Complainant has owned the domain name <lightthenight.org> since at least 1999.

The Respondent is an individual who states that she owns and operates Light the Night Corp., a Delaware for-profit corporation that organizes, promotes, and sells tickets to events under the branding "Light the Night". According to the Respondent, these events each feature lanterns and include sky lantern festivals, water lantern festivals, lantern walks, and music festivals. The Respondent states that she has organized, promoted, and sold tickets to "Light the Night" events since 2018.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on December 13, 2023. At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website on which the Respondent promoted and purported to sell tickets to events under "Light the Night" branding. The website noted that, although Light the Night Corp. is a for-profit entity, it donates a portion of its proceeds to charitable partners.

The instant proceeding is the latest chapter in a years-long dispute between the parties. In 2019, the Complainant's counsel sent a letter to the Respondent to notify the Respondent of the Complainant's rights in the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark and demand that the Respondent cease use of the trademark, including in the domain name <lightthenightevents.com>. In 2024, the Complainant filed a UDRP Complaint against the Respondent, seeking transfer of the domain name <lightthenightevents.com> (the "prior proceeding"). The Respondent did not submit a Response in the prior proceeding. The panel in the prior proceeding found that the Complainant had met its burden under the UDRP and ordered that the domain name be transferred to the Complainant. *The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, Inc. v. tina York*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4136](#).

5. Recusal, Termination of Proceedings, and Allegations of Misconduct

In its supplemental filings, the Respondent challenges the impartiality of the Panelist, David H. Bernstein. The Respondent further requests that the Center terminate this proceeding because it relates to the same subject matter as an ongoing federal litigation, because it raises questions outside the scope of the UDRP, and because of alleged procedural defects.¹ Finally, the Respondent argues that the Complainant and its counsel have engaged in a pattern of misconduct related to the proceeding and enforcement of the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademarks. The Panel has reviewed each of these arguments and finds that none has merit.

A. Recusal Is Not Warranted

Rule 7 of the Policy requires that an appointed panelist “shall be impartial and independent and shall have, before accepting appointment, disclosed to the Provider any circumstances giving rise to justifiable doubt as to the Panelist’s impartiality or independence.” The general practice in cases in which a party raises concerns about a panelist’s impartiality is for the Panel to consider whether recusal is warranted. In order to warrant recusal, the moving party must show “justifiable doubt”—that is, that a reasonable, objective person would be justified in doubting the panelist’s impartiality after considering the evidence. *Britannia Building Society v. Britannia Fraud Prevention*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0505](#). “[J]ustifiable doubt as to a panelist’s impartiality or independence may arise, *inter alia*, if the panelist has demonstrated personal bias for or against one of the parties, possesses a financial interest in the outcome of the dispute, or represents or has represented one of the parties or a third party in a dispute with one of the parties.” *Id.*

None of the Respondent’s allegations give rise to a “justifiable doubt” as to the Panelist’s impartiality and independence. First, the Respondent alleges that the panelist in the prior proceeding, failed to disclose that the law firm where he practiced had participated in the Complainant’s Light the Night events and therefore withheld evidence that would tend to cast doubt as to his impartiality or independence. Those are issues that the Respondent could have raised in the prior proceeding, but did not. This Panel is not privy to the case file in the prior proceeding, or the facts as alleged by the Respondent, and therefore is not in a position to comment upon them. In any event, any challenge to the prior panel’s impartiality and independence is irrelevant to this proceeding because the prior panel is not a panelist in this matter, and this Panel is not bound or influenced in any way by the decision in the prior proceeding.

The Respondent argues that the prior panel’s independence is relevant because he and the Panelist in this proceeding are affiliated with WIPO’s New York office, and therefore, the Panelist in this proceeding is tainted by any challenge to the prior panel’s impartiality or independence. That, however, is factually incorrect. There is no WIPO New York office with which the prior panel and the Panelist in this matter are affiliated; the WIPO Coordination Office in New York functions as WIPO’s liaison to the United Nations. The prior panel is a partner in Nelson Mullins, a law firm in Charleston, South Carolina; the Panelist in this matter is a partner with Debevoise & Plimpton, in its New York office. Although both the prior panel and the Panelist in this matter are on the WIPO Panel of Neutrals, they are independent of each other and are associated with entirely different law firms.

The Respondent has offered no other evidence to support its claim that the Panelist in this matter is neither impartial nor independent, such as evidence that the Panelist has demonstrated personal bias for or against either party, possesses a financial interest in the outcome of the dispute, or has represented one of the parties or a third party in a dispute with one of the parties. The Respondent relies solely on her theory of bias-by-association, which would apply to any panelist on the WIPO Panel of Neutrals. Such broad and unsupported allegations are insufficient to show a lack of impartiality or independence. Cf. WIPO Overview

¹Paragraph 10 of the Rules vests the Panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence as well as to conduct the proceedings with due expedition. Although panels generally discourage unsolicited supplemental filings, see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.6, the Panel considered these arguments because they touch on fundamental questions related to the integrity of the proceeding and whether the dispute is within the scope of the UDRP.

of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.2.

B. Termination Is Not Warranted

i. Termination Based on Concurrent Proceedings

Paragraph 18(a) of the Rules gives panels discretion to suspend, terminate, or continue proceedings where the disputed domain name is also the subject of concurrent legal proceedings. The Respondent claims that the dispute between the parties “involves imminent federal lawsuits” against the Complainant and its counsel.² The Respondent further argues that this proceeding may interfere with such ongoing litigation, and goes so far as to contend that failure to terminate the proceeding may expose the Center to civil and criminal liability.

Putting aside the Respondent’s entirely unsupported assertions of civil and criminal liability, her request to terminate the proceeding is deficient as a matter of both fact and policy. Although the Respondent claims that this proceeding may impede related federal litigation, she does not show litigation related to the subject matter of this proceeding is currently pending in another court of competent jurisdiction. The Panel’s authority to terminate proceedings under paragraph 18(a) contemplates concurrent proceedings, not speculative future proceedings. Even if the Respondent had identified concurrent court proceedings, it still fails to justify termination. Panels are reluctant to suspend or terminate proceedings under the UDRP due to concurrent court proceedings. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.14. Instead, even when concurrent litigation is pending, panels regularly issue UDRP decisions on the merits, as the relative expediency of UDRP proceedings is seen as beneficial to the parties as well as the court. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.14.2. Therefore, the Panel proceeds to decision, and notes that, if the Respondent disagrees with this Panel’s decision, she has the right to seek to suspend implementation of this decision under paragraph 4(k) of the Policy.

ii. Termination Based on the Limited Scope of the UDRP

The Respondent further argues that the proceeding must be terminated because the UDRP is inadequate to resolve the dispute between the parties. According to the Respondent, the dispute involves complex legal and factual issues related to corporate and common law rights, the resolution of which are outside the scope of the UDRP.

As a preliminary matter, the Panel believes that dismissing cases solely on the basis of factual complexity is a misapplication of the Policy. Although the Policy is intended to provide an expedited process to resolve narrow claims of cybersquatting, that does not mean that UDRP panelists cannot rule in cases that involve complex or disputed facts. Instead, a panel faced with complex or disputed facts should adjudicate the dispute “as best it can, drawing reasonable inferences when appropriate and using a preponderance of the evidence standard to make fact findings.” *Deal Hill Systems Ltd. v. Gregiry Santana d/b/a Invicta*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0404](#); see also *Bootie Brewing Company v. Deanna D. Ward and Grabebootie Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0185](#) (“[J]ust because the record is complex does not mean that the Panel should decline to review it. Rather, the Panel’s obligation when faced with such disputed facts is to make the best findings it can, by a preponderance of the evidence, based on the record submitted.”).

Further, and in any event, the relevant issues presented in the Complaint are not complex at all. They fall squarely within the scope of the UDRP, and the record contains factual allegations sufficient for the Panel to

²The Respondent also claims that she filed a complaint with the United Nations Human Rights Council concerning the Complainant’s allegedly coercive and retaliatory conduct and attempts to interfere with her business. The Respondent does not expressly seek termination of this proceeding based on this alleged filing. To the extent she does seek termination on that basis, the Panel rejects her request because the Respondent fails to provide evidence of that filing with the United Nations or explain why that filing requires termination of this proceeding.

decide whether the Complainant has satisfied each element of the Policy. The ancillary issues raised by the Respondent are largely irrelevant to the issues that the Panel must decide in applying the Policy to the facts of this case, and do not justify dismissal.

iii. Procedural Defects

The Respondent finally argues that the Panel must terminate this proceeding due to procedural defects.

First, she argues that the proceeding must be dismissed because the Complaint names the Respondent in her individual capacity, rather than Light the Night Corp. However, after the Complaint was submitted, the Provider submitted a verification request to the Registrar, and the Registrar provided registration data for the disputed domain name, pursuant to Rule 4(a)-(b) of the Policy. The registration data identified the Respondent in her individual capacity in the Registrant Name, Administrative Name, Billing Name, and Technical Name fields for the disputed domain name. As such, the Respondent's objection on this ground lacks merit.

The Respondent further argues that this proceeding must be terminated because the Complainant either does not exist as a legal entity or does not own valid rights to the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademarks. The Respondent, however, fails to substantiate her bald allegations that the Complainant does not exist as a legal entity, and the record of the Complainant's trademark registrations belies that assertion. As to the question of whether the Complainant has rights to a trademark that is identical or confusingly similar to the disputed domain name, that is a question that goes to the merits of the Complainant's claim. Accordingly, the Panel addresses this issue below, under the first element of the Policy.

The Respondent also argues that she was denied due process in the prior proceeding because she was not notified of the Complaint until the domain name at issue was transferred to the Complainant. As noted above, the Panel is not privy to the case file in the prior proceeding, and the Respondent has failed to submit any factual allegations or evidence to substantiate this assertion. In any event, the decision in the prior proceeding has no impact on the Panel's decision in this case, which is based solely on the record presented to this Panel. As such, any issue relating to the conduct of the prior proceeding is irrelevant to the issues raised in this proceeding.

C. Respondent's Allegations of Misconduct Are Unsupported

Finally, the Respondent alleges that the Complainant's counsel has engaged in bad faith conduct in the course of this proceeding and in attempting to assert the Complainant's rights in the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark in other contexts. The Respondent also claims that the Complainant's counsel has a conflict of interest because that counsel previously represented the Complainant in a domestic relations matter (an allegation that the Complainant's counsel denies).

With respect to this proceeding, the Respondent argues that the Complaint contains deliberate misstatements of fact, but she fails to support those allegations. The Respondent alleges that the Complainant falsely filed the Complaint against the Respondent in her personal capacity and falsely claims ownership of the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademarks. As discussed above, however, the Respondent is correctly named in the Complaint, based on the verification provided by the Registrar. And, as explained below, the Respondent fails to disprove the Complainant's ownership of the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademarks. The Respondent further claims that the Complainant has misrepresented its use of the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademarks and the nature of its Light the Night events. However, she offers only one photograph in support of her otherwise conclusory assertions, and the photograph does not contradict the Complainant's own description of its trademark use.

With respect to the Respondent's allegations regarding counsel's conduct outside of this proceeding, the Panel notes that the Respondent has made only bald, unsupported, conclusory allegations and has not provided any concrete allegations of fact or documentary evidence from which the Panel may determine the veracity of the allegations or their relevance to the issues in this proceeding. As such, the Respondent fails to establish any misconduct or wrongdoing by the Complainant or its counsel.

6. 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.

First, the Complainant alleges that it has rights in the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark because it owns six United States trademark registrations for the mark. The Complainant then argues that the disputed domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark because it contains the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark in its entirety. The Complainant further argues that the likelihood of confusion between its trademark and the disputed domain name is exacerbated by the fact that the disputed domain name specifically refers to the Complainant's core business (i.e., live, in-person events involving the use of lights at night).

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, is making non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, or uses the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant also asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks. Further, the Complainant argues that none of the events that the Respondent purports to have organized and sold tickets for actually existed. Instead, the Complainant claims, the Respondent has used the well-known LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark to confuse consumers, divert traffic away from the Complainant's legitimate website, and trick consumers into purchasing non-refundable tickets for non-existent events.

Third, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant notes that it used the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark for decades prior to the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name and that it previously notified the Respondent of its trademark rights through a cease-and-desist letter. As a result, the Respondent had both constructive and actual notice of the Complainant's rights in the trademark prior to registering the dispute domain name. Given notice of the Complainant's rights in the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark and the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent must have registered the disputed domain name to mislead consumers for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied any of the three the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent initially did not dispute that the Complainant owns the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademarks. Rather, the Respondent argued in its Response that the Complainant did not allege ownership of trademark registrations for LIGHT THE NIGHT for goods and services in International Class 41, which encompasses the entertainment services, live events, festivals and event production services offered by the Respondent.

However, in its supplemental filings, the Respondent raises a host of theories as to why the Complainant does not have trademark rights for purposes of the Policy. The Respondent's primary argument is that the Complainant is not the actual owner of the LIGHT THE NIGHT mark because it is a non-existent or legally invalid entity and is therefore incapable of holding intellectual property rights. The Respondent relatedly

argues that the Complainant acquired its rights in the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademarks through an invalid assignment. The Respondent further asserts that the Complainant's LIGHT THE NIGHT mark is a campaign name or slogan that does not create enforceable rights against bona fide commercial use of similar marks in a different class of goods and services.

Second, the Respondent contends that it has legitimate rights in the disputed domain name because it is owned and used by the Respondent's company, Light the Night Corp.; it is used in connection with a bona fide offering of services; and because the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in connection with services that are distinct from the charitable activities for which the Complainant uses its LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark.

Third, the Respondent argues the Complainant cannot establish bad faith because the disputed domain name was registered by a legitimate business entity and used for lawful commercial purposes, and because the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in connection with services which are distinct from those offered by the Complainant.

Finally, the Respondent asserts that the Complainant is engaged in a bad faith attempt to interfere with her business through the UDRP, which amounts to a Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

7. Discussion and Findings

In order to obtain transfer of the disputed domain name, Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that: (1) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (3) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Although conclusory statements are insufficient to prove a party's case, the Panel may draw inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case, including where a particular conclusion is *prima facie* obvious, where an explanation by the respondent is called for but is not forthcoming, or where no other plausible conclusion is apparent.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied its burden on each of the required elements.

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 mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy, as it owns six United States trademark registrations for LIGHT THE NIGHT. Ownership of a nationally-registered trademark *prima facie* satisfies the threshold requirement that the Complainant has trademark rights. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. As discussed above, the Respondent argues in its supplemental filings that the Complainant lacks standing under the UDRP for a variety of reasons, including because the Complainant is a legally non-existent entity and cannot maintain intellectual property rights. However, the Respondent fails to offer any evidence to support its conclusory allegations. In any event, the Respondent's claims are disproven by public records, which show that Blood Cancer United, Inc. is a non-profit corporation registered with the State of New York and owns the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark registrations.

The LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark is identical to the disputed domain name for purposes of the Policy, as it is reproduced entirely in the disputed domain name, with only the addition of the ".live" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The Respondent does not dispute that the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark and the disputed domain name are identical, but rather argues that they are used in

connection with distinct classes of goods and services. Although the goods and services with which a trademark is used may be relevant to the analysis of trademark infringement (which may be relevant under the second and third factors), the first element of the Policy calls for a straightforward comparison of the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name in order to assess standing.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden of establishing the first element of the Policy.

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.

The Respondent claims that she uses the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, namely the organization, promotion, and sale of tickets to events featuring lantern-related activities. However, the Complainant has submitted evidence that raises significant questions about the veracity of the Respondent's claims. Specifically, the Complainant argues that the Respondent's claims are a sham, and that her website promotes events that never actually happened and that the Respondent uses the website to which the disputed domain name resolves to defraud consumers and sell them tickets to non-existing events. In support of these assertions, the Complainant submitted evidence that the Respondent promoted an event that was supposed to take place in Phoenix, Arizona on November 29, 2025, but event calendars for the City of Phoenix and nearby locations did not include the purported event.

In the face of these credible allegations, it is the Respondent's obligation to come forward with evidence that rebuts this showing, such as evidence that it really has used the disputed domain name for authentic "Light The Night" events. The Respondent has failed to do so. Other than its conclusory allegations – which have the feeling of having been written by a generative AI model and lack indicia of authenticity – the Respondent submits no evidence at all that these events actually happened, that it actually sold any tickets, or that it actually donated any money to charity.

Importantly, even if the Respondent did offer any real "Light The Night" events, that still would not be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's *prima facie* showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. That is because, if the Respondent did use the disputed domain name for evening events raising money for charity, that would infringe the Complainant's rights in the mark, and an infringing use is not a bona fide use. *ORIENT EXPRESS v. Nguyen Trong Hanh*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2528](#) ("A use cannot be deemed bona fide, though, if the use at issue constitutes trademark infringement"); *Nara Aziza Smith v. Vanessa Clarke*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1839](#) ("an infringing use cannot be bona fide"); *On AG, On Clouds GmbH v. Nguyen Luu, Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf, Vuong Hoang, AN NGUYEN, NEO CORP., and Ngoc Tam Nguyen*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1714](#) ("a use cannot be deemed bona fide if the disputed domain names constitute trademark infringement").

The Complainant has submitted sufficient evidence to establish that any use by the Respondent of the disputed domain name for the events she purports to offer would be infringement. The disputed domain name is identical to the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark, with only the addition of the gTLD ".live", which is descriptive of the live events that the Complainant offers and that the Respondent purports to offer. The LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark is commercially strong, as the Complainant has used the mark for more than 25 years and has raised over USD 1 billion in connection with the mark. The Respondent attempts to distinguish its for-profit services from the Complainant's charitable events, but the Panel finds that the parties offer competing services, as both organize events that prominently incorporate illuminated lanterns. Indeed, the Respondent specifically advertises "lantern walks", which are conceptually similar to the Complainant's "Light The Night" events. And, although the Respondent's events are for-profit, it promotes a charitable component of the events on its website.

Thus, on balance, the Panel finds that the Respondent's purported use of the disputed domain name to promote "lantern walks" and similar evening events constitutes infringement of the Complainant's trademark. And, given the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its trademark rights prior to registering the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent's infringement is willful and reflects an attempt to trade on the Complainant's goodwill and reputation. Use of a domain name for such illegitimate activity cannot confer rights or legitimate interests in a domain name for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel therefore finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that support a finding that a disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith. For example, bad faith exists where, "by using the domain name, [a respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [its] web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [its] web site or location or of a product or service on [its] web site or location." Policy, paragraph 4(b). Panels have found that registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark can create a presumption that the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion. WIPO Overview, section 3.1.4. Where a disputed domain name is so similar to the complainant's trademark, the respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the domain name may serve as further evidence of bad faith. *Id.*

The Panel finds, based on the evidence presented, that the Complainant registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant has established that it has used the LIGHT THE NIGHT trademark in connection with charitable events involving illuminated lanterns for more than 25 years. Those events have raised more than USD 1 billion for the Complainant's charitable mission. Upon learning of the Respondent's use of the LIGHT THE NIGHT marks in 2019, the Complainant alerted the Respondent to its prior rights and demanded that the Respondent cease infringing use of the marks. Those allegations show that the Respondent had actual notice of the Complainant's strong trademark rights when it registered the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's mark with the addition of a descriptive term and in which the Respondent has no rights of her own. The Respondent also used the disputed domain name for similar evening events with lanterns that are likely to cause confusion with the Complainant's events. That the Respondent purports to donate some of the proceeds to charity only exacerbates the likelihood of confusion.

If the Respondent genuinely wants to hold events at night that revolve around lanterns, she is, of course, free to do so. What she cannot do is brand those events with a trademark that is likely to confuse consumers into believing that the event comes from or is associated with the Complainant and its well-known LIGHT THE NIGHT events. That the Respondent continues to try to promote such events with a domain name that mimics the Complainant's trademark supports a finding that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is willful bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Having found in favor of the Complainant, the Panel does not consider the Respondent's reverse domain name hijacking claim.

8. 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 <lightthenight.live> be transferred to the Complainant.

/David H. Bernstein/

David H. Bernstein

Sole Panelist

Date: January 13, 2026