

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. Domain Privacy,
Domain Name Privacy Inc.
Case No. D2025-4768

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc., Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fifa-coins.com> is registered with Soaring Eagle Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 18, 2025. On November 18, 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 (fifa-coinscom-reg, Redacted for Privacy) 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 November 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on December 22, 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 the international governing body of association football (also known as “soccer”), founded in 1904. It operates under the brand corresponding to its acronym, FIFA, and organizes major international tournaments, including the FIFA World Cup, the FIFA Women’s World Cup, the FIFA Club World Cup, and the FIFA Beach Soccer World Cup. To finance these events, the Complainant operates a global commercial program involving numerous partners, sponsors, and tournament supporters, and maintains a licensing program with official licensees (collectively referred to as “commercial affiliates”). The Complainant’s revenues are also derived from the sale of television broadcasting, marketing and licensing, hospitality rights, and ticket sales. According to the evidence submitted, the Complainant’s total revenue for the 2019–2022 financial period amounted to USD 7.6 billion.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations for the brand FIFA in numerous jurisdictions, including the following:

- International Trademark Registration No. 633108, FIFA (word), registered on February 22, 1995, in Classes 25 and 28;

- International Trademark registration No. 747778, FIFA (figurative), registered on June 2, 2000, 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, and 42, with the following graphic representation:

FIFA

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 009027343, FIFA (figurative), registered on October 14, 2010, 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, with the following graphic representation:

FIFA

- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 2352934, FIFA (word), registered on May 30, 2000, in Classes 25 and 28.

(Hereinafter collectively referred to as the “FIFA Mark”).

The Complainant further owns the domain name <fifa.com> (registered on August 9, 1995), which resolves to its official website and online store for tickets and other merchandise.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 11, 2024, and currently resolves to an alert page indicating that the website has been blocked due to a potential malicious risk.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously resolved to different websites depending on unknown parameters, such as the user’s browser, device, or operating system. These websites included the following:

(i) a website featuring pay-per-click (“PPC”) links directing users to third-party websites under sections titled “FIND MY COIN VALUE ONLINE,” “BUY GOLD COINS ONLINE,” “BUY AND SELL DIGITAL COINS,” “CHEAP FIFA COINS ONLINE SALE,” and “CHEAP FOOTBALL JERSEYS”; and

(ii) an online casino website operating under the name “PAYZILLA,” which purportedly offered live sports events among various games and betting options, with prices listed in USD and EUR. This website did not disclose any lack of relationship with the Complainant or its trademark.

The Respondent has used a multi-layered privacy service. The disclosed registrant, according to the Registrar’s verification, is itself another privacy or proxy service.

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 is confusingly similar to its well-known trademark, as it incorporates the FIFA Mark in its entirety, and that the addition of the term “coins” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The term “coins” may refer to physical coins, such as licensed sports memorabilia or collectibles, or to virtual assets or cryptocurrencies offered or officially endorsed by the Complainant. The Complainant’s registered trademarks cover “coins” in Class 14, and a FIFA-branded cryptocurrency has been the subject of attention in global media.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized to use the FIFA Mark, and is not making a legitimate or fair use, nor a bona fide offering of goods or services, under the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has been used to generate revenue through a PPC page listing third-party websites—some of which refer to the FIFA Mark and potentially compete with the Complainant—or through an online casino website that is entirely unrelated to the Complainant and its trademark. From 1993 to 2022, the Complainant licensed a third party, EA Sports, to produce video games that included a system of in-game tokens or virtual currency known as “FC Coins,” “FUT Coins,” and “FIFA Points.” These tokens were never referred to as “FIFA Coins,” and the relevant licensing agreement ended in 2022.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, with the intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion or a false affiliation with the Complainant’s well-known trademark. Given the reputation, distinctive character, and extensive use of the FIFA Mark for many years before the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent can reasonably be presumed to have had prior knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for the content appearing on the website associated with the disputed domain name, particularly where one of the PPC sections explicitly included the term “FIFA.” The Respondent’s use of a multi-layered privacy service further supports an attempt to conceal its identity and shield its bad-faith conduct.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant has submitted all relevant assertions under the Policy, and the dispute properly falls within its scope. The Panel has the authority to decide the dispute by examining the three elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into account all relevant evidence, annexed materials, and submissions. The Panel may also conduct limited independent research pursuant to its general powers, as provided, *inter alia*, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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, namely the FIFA Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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

The addition of the term "coins," separated by a hyphen, may be relevant to the assessment of the second and third elements of the Policy; however, it does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the FIFA Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, 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.

The Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case and has not submitted any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the term "FIFA," which is a coined term derived from the Complainant's acronym and does not appear in any dictionary.

Panels have consistently held that, for a respondent to establish rights or legitimate interests in a domain name comprising an acronym, the respondent must provide credible evidence demonstrating a legitimate intent that does not seek to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill associated with the complainant's trademark. In the present case, the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10.2.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent has made use of privacy or proxy services to shield its identity, and nothing in the record suggests that the Respondent's name bears any resemblance to the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name in connection with (i) a PPC website promoting third-party websites under various sections—one of which expressly refers to the FIFA Mark and includes potentially competing and unrelated websites—or (ii) an online casino website unrelated to the Complainant and its trademark, creates a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant and cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a PPC website, panels have consistently held that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services where the links capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's trademark or otherwise mislead Internet users, as is the case here. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

The Panel further finds that the composition of the disputed domain name gives rise to a risk of implied affiliation, effectively suggesting sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. The inclusion of the FIFA Mark, followed by the term “coins” separated by a hyphen, falsely suggests that the disputed domain name is owned or endorsed by the Complainant or one of its commercial affiliates in connection with physical coins, virtual currencies, or digital tokens related to its tournaments. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.

The fact that the Complainant had previously operated, through licensed or affiliated entities, a system of in-game tokens or virtual currency between 1993 and 2022 further reinforces the likelihood of false affiliation and enhances the misleading nature of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, 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. Other circumstances may also be relevant in assessing bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes the distinctive character, long-standing reputation, and extensive use of the FIFA Mark for many years. Prior decisions under the Policy have consistently recognized the reputation of the FIFA Mark, a conclusion with which the Panel concurs based on the record and its assessment of the case. See, e.g., *Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. Javier Perez*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1372](#); *Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. Moussa Riffi*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0390](#); *Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. Tae Sung Park*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2505](#); and *Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. isaac rabinowitsch*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3774](#).

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name has been used, inter alia, in connection with a PPC website that expressly refers to the FIFA Mark in one of its sections.

In light of the composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the Respondent's website, the Panel finds that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant and its well-known trademark, engaging in opportunistic bad faith in the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent's decision to combine the FIFA Mark with the term “coins,” separated by a hyphen—a product category for which the Complainant has registered and used the FIFA Mark—cannot be attributed to mere coincidence. Rather, it demonstrates a deliberate intent to create a misleading association in order to attract Internet users for commercial gain, constituting bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Under these circumstances, the fact that the content associated with the disputed domain name is currently blocked—or even that its content may have been removed—does not alter the Panel's finding. Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain

name, and its prior use in connection with a PPC website or an online casino falsely suggesting affiliation for commercial gain, the Panel finds that even passive holding of the disputed domain name supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Consequently, 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 <fifa-coins.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebarez/

Reyes Campello Estebarez

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025