

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. Cevriye Kınacı
Case No. D2025-4750

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), Switzerland, represented by K&L Gates, Australia.

The Respondent is Cevriye Kınacı, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fifacoins.org> is registered with Isimtescil Bilişim A.Ş. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 17, 2025. 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 18, 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 (Protected by privacy service) and contact information 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 amended Complaint on November 27, 2025.

On November 24, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Turkish and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Turkish. On November 27, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 December 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on January 5, 2026. 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 the widely known world governing body of the sport of football and the organizer of various international football tournaments.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for FIFA, including the following:

- International Trademark Registration No. 633108, registered on February 22, 1995, for FIFA (word mark), covering goods in classes 25 and 28;
- International Trademark Registration No. 747778, registered on June 2, 2000, for FIFA (device mark), covering goods and services in classes 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 (including "coins"), 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42; and
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. 909027343, registered on October 14, 2010, for FIFA (device mark), covering goods and services in classes 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 45.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <fifa.com>.

From 1993 to 2022, the Complainant's licensee published video games that included in-game tokens or currency previously called "FC Coins", "FUT Coins" and "FIFA Points".

The Respondent is reportedly located in Türkiye.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 7, 2024.

According to provided screenshots by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a website in English and Turkish languages, allegedly enabling sales of virtual in-game tokens apparently dedicated for use in football-related video games. In addition, according to the evidence, the associated website does not provide for any visible disclaimer disclosing the (lack of) relationship between the Parties.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Turkish. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name includes the English word “coin”, that the Complainant has no knowledge of Turkish and that filing a translation of the Complaint would be time and costs intensive.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding, even though communicated by the Center in Turkish and English.

The Panel notes that the website associated to the disputed domain name has been made available in both, English and Turkish, which indicates that the Respondent is able to read, write in, and understand English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above and bearing in mind that the Respondent has not objected the Complainant's request concerning the language of the proceeding, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (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.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel might, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 the FIFA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the FIFA mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the FIFA mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "coins", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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. Particularly, the Complainant put forward that the Respondent is neither a business partner of the Complainant nor a licensee of its FIFA trademark and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the term "fifacoins", or any other similar term. 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 further finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant's widely known FIFA trademark in its entirety, gives rise to a risk of implied affiliation, effectively suggesting sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [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.

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 Panel believes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its widely known FIFA trademark when registering the disputed domain name. It is obvious to the Panel, that the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant's FIFA trademark in its entirety in combination with the term "coins", demonstrates its knowledge of the Complainant and intention to target the Complainant. This constitutes bad faith registration under the Policy.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in order to generate traffic to its own website by misleading Internet users in a false belief that the website associated with the disputed domain name is operated or at least authorized by the Complainant. Particularly, the offering of in-game "coins" for football video games is in view of the Panel evidence of the Respondent's bad faith intent to target the Complainant for illegitimate commercial gain by deliberately creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's FIFA trademark.

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 <fifacoins.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: January 19, 2026