

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. Pongsagon
Maswongsri
Case No. D2025-4751

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Pongsagon Maswongsri, Thailand.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fifa-coin.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (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 17, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, 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 21, 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 25, 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 December 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Torsten Bettinger as the sole panelist in this matter on January 2, 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 international governing body of the sport of football and the organizer of major international football tournaments, including the FIFA World Cup, the FIFA Women's World Cup, the FIFA Club World Cup, and the FIFA Beach Soccer World Cup.

For the 2019-2022 financial period, the Complainant reported revenues of approximately USD 7.6 billion, derived primarily from broadcasting, marketing, licensing, hospitality, and ticket sales.

The Complainant owns extensive intellectual property rights worldwide. The trademark FIFA is the Complainant's principal mark and is used globally in relation to its governance functions, tournaments, and related goods and services.

The Complainant holds numerous registered trademark rights in FIFA across multiple jurisdictions, including

- International Trademark No. 633108 for FIFA (word mark), registered on February 22, 1995, for goods in classes 25 and 28;
- International Trademark No. 747778 for (device mark), registered on June 2, 2000, for 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 Trade mark No. 909027343 for (device mark), registered on October 14, 2010, for 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 also owns and operates the domain name <fifa.com>, which hosts its primary website. This website provides information and multimedia content relating to football and the Complainant's activities and incorporates official platforms for merchandise sales, digital content and streaming, ticketing and hospitality packages, and digital collectibles.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active, independent website operated by the Respondent. Instead, it resolves to a default hosting and domain landing page provided by the Registrar.

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.

With regard to the requirement of "identity or confusing similarity between the trademark and the domain name" pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant submits that:

- the disputed domain name incorporates the FIFA trademark in its entirety as the dominant element, with the mere addition of the descriptive term "coin";
- the inclusion of this additional term does not dispel confusion or distinguish the disputed domain name; from its trademark, as Internet users would still clearly recognize the FIFA mark within the disputed domain name;

- the term “coin” is descriptive and may reasonably be understood as referring to physical collectibles or virtual or digital assets that consumers could legitimately expect to be offered, licensed, or endorsed by the Complainant, particularly in light of its extensive licensing activities and trademark coverage;
- prior UDRP decision found that the addition of the term “coin” to the Complainant’s trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

With regard to the Respondent having no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant submitted that,

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name resolves to a parked website and is not used in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it;
- the Respondent is neither authorized nor licensed by the Complainant, and has no affiliation with the Complainant or permission to use the FIFA trademark in any manner.

Finally, with regard to the disputed domain name having been registered and being used in bad faith, the Complainant argues that,

- the disputed domain name consists of the FIFA trademark combined with a descriptive term and was registered decades after the Complainant had established extensive and worldwide trademark rights in FIFA, by which time the mark was well known globally; the Respondent therefore knew or should have known of the Complainant’s trademark rights at the time of registration, and that bad faith may therefore be presumed;
- the Respondent has no authorization, sponsorship, or approval from the Complainant to use the FIFA trademark;
- the disputed domain name has not been used for any legitimate purpose and resolves to a parked or inactive website;
- the passive holding of a domain name incorporating a famous trademark may constitute bad faith, particularly where there is no plausible good-faith explanation for the registration;
- the registration of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated respondent, without any credible justification, supports an inference of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant must prove each of the three following elements:

- (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 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 disputed domain name incorporates the FIFA trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term “coin” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Under well-established UDRP precedent and section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), where a complainant’s trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms—whether descriptive, generic, or otherwise—does not avoid confusing similarity.

The inclusion of the generic Top-Level Domain is a technical requirement of domain name registration and is disregarded for the purpose of the confusing similarity analysis. WIPO Overview, 3.0, section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

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.

The record shows that the Complainant’s trademark registrations predate the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, approved, or otherwise consented to the Respondent’s registration or use of its mark in the disputed domain name.

The term “coin” in the disputed domain name is descriptive, and it may increase the likelihood of confusion, as Internet users could reasonably assume that the disputed domain name refers to an official product, service, or initiative of the Complainant, such as licensed collectibles or digital assets.

On this basis, the Complainant has made a *prima facie* showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. There is no evidence that, prior to notice of the dispute, the Respondent used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Although afforded the opportunity, the Respondent has not come forward with any circumstances under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy (or otherwise) to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests.

The Respondent has provided no evidence that it owns any relevant trademark, is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or intends to make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain or to misleadingly divert consumers.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant’s *prima facie* case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is therefore satisfied.

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.

(i) Bad Faith Registration

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's FIFA trademark is highly distinctive and globally famous, having been used and registered for decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. In the absence of a plausible explanation for the Respondent as to its choice of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with an intention to target the Complainant's rights.

The disputed domain name consists of the FIFA trademark combined with the descriptive term "coin." Such a construction is inherently suggestive of an official product, service, or initiative of the Complainant. The deliberate selection of a well-known trademark together with a term associated with collectibles or digital assets demonstrates that the Respondent sought to exploit the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant at the time of registration.

Given the fame of the FIFA trademark and the absence of any relationship between the Parties, the Panel can reasonably infer that on the balance of probabilities the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with prior knowledge of the Complainant's rights and with the intent to create confusion. This constitutes bad faith registration within the meaning of the Policy.

(ii) Bad Faith Use

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a parked website and has not been used for any bona fide offering of goods or services. Under established UDRP principles, including section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the passive holding of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

The Complainant's trademark enjoys an exceptionally strong global reputation, the Respondent has provided no explanation for its registration of the disputed domain name, and there is no conceivable good-faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put without misleading Internet users. These circumstances support a finding of bad faith even in the absence of active use.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name is such that it creates a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The continued holding of the disputed domain name therefore carries an inherent risk of abusive use and reflects an intent to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <fifa-coin.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Torsten Bettinger/

Torsten Bettinger

Sole Panelist

Date: January 16, 2026