

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cellcast UK Ltd. v. tian tao

Case No. D2025-4775

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cellcast UK Ltd., United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is tian tao, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <babestationapp.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (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 19, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 20, 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 21, 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 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on December 17, 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 founded BABESTATION, an adult TV entertainment service, in 2002. The Complainant is currently one of the longest running interactive television channels in the British adult content sector. As well as the UK, the Complainant has provided services in Germany, Brazil, South Africa, and briefly in the United States of America. In 2015, the Complainant expanded their services online, making available BABESTATION content in other countries. The Complainant is well advertised in the UK and is often in online news outlets such as, “The Sun”, “Daily Star”, “Daily Mail”, and “Daily Mirror”, where articles are written about the Complainant’s brand and hosts’ personal lives. Additionally, the Complainant sponsors many award ceremonies in the adult industry such as “UK Glamour” and “UKAP”.

The Complainant and associated companies hold the registered trademarks for BABESTATION, including for instance the European Union trademark registration No. 018252858, registered on November 5, 2020.

The Complainant registered the domain name of its official website, <babestation.tv>, on June 26, 2002, and has had a strong web presence since that date. The Complainant’s official website, according to third-party statistics, averaged over 4.4 million visits between July – September 2025 from users worldwide. The Complainant is active on social media, promoting their services online on Instagram and X.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 11, 2025, and redirects to a website “www.fullyadult.com/49937/” with explicit adult content and advertising links to third-party adult services which compete with the Complainant’s services. The website also prominently features the Complainant’s trademark and provides for a link to the Complainant’s website.

A cease and desist letter was sent to the Respondent via email on September 19, 2025, however no response followed.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. The Complainant’s mark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name with the addition of the word “app”. With regards to the generic top-level domain (gTLD) “.com”, which forms part of the disputed domain name, the Complainant requests that the Panel disregard it under the first element as it is a standard registration requirement.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not have any trademark rights to the term BABESTATION nor any similar term. There is also no evidence that the Respondent retains any unregistered trademark rights to the term BABESTATION. Neither has the Respondent received any license from the Complainant to use a domain name featuring the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name redirects to “www.fullyadult.com/49937/”, a webpage that provides a link to the Complainant’s services and unverified information about BABESTATION. Upon accessing the link, users are immediately

presented with explicit pornographic content through pop-up advertisements. The Complainant contends that this is different from the Complainant's responsible approach as an adult content provider, where all explicit material is blurred and only accessible after an age verification. Additionally, there are links to third-party adult services which compete with the Complainant's services. The Respondent previously used the webpage that provided a link to the Complainant's services as well as a guide on how to navigate the Complainant's official website. The use of the disputed domain name in order to capitalize on the Complainant's mark is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent, without authorization from the Complainant, uses the Complainant's mark to attract Internet users to a website which contains explicit advertisements. The Respondent seeks to garner advertising revenue from the traffic generated through the unauthorized use of the Complainant's well-known mark. The Respondent is not known, nor has ever been genuinely known by the term BABESTATION, "babestationapp", or anything similar. Therefore, there is no plausible reason for the registration and use of the disputed domain name, other than the motive of taking advantage of the goodwill and reputation attached to the Complainant's mark. The Complainant's trademark is well-known and the Respondent has intended to use the disputed domain name to target the Complainant. The Complainant has an app, which can be accessed through their main website. This shows that the term "app" in the disputed domain name has relevance to the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is used for a webpage containing many advertisements. This cannot be construed as a legitimate non-commercial, or fair use of the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is diverting traffic to their website, and making a commercial gain from it.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark registrations predate the creation date of the disputed domain name. Given the Respondent's clear and prominent use of the Complainant's marks in the disputed domain name and website, and references to the Complainant's services, it is clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights in the Complainant's mark. The selection of a domain name that is so obviously connected to a complainant's trademark strongly suggests opportunistic bad faith, particularly where it is used by someone with no affiliation with the complainant. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name, which passes off as the Complainant, primarily to gain advertising revenue. The Respondent did not attempt to disclaim the lack of association with the Complainant through the disputed domain name's site. On the contrary, its use of the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark, is purposefully misleading. The information offered about the Complainant's services is unverified, and at times entirely unrelated to the Complainant's mark, such as comparing the Complainant's services with purchasing a PlayStation 5. The Respondent has been subject to numerous past UDRP proceedings, all concluding the Respondent has registered and used third party trademarks in bad faith. Thus, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, “app”, 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 applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., “.com”, “.club”, “.nyc”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the Panel disregards the gTLD “.com” for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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 available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones, TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise agree for use of its prior registered trademarks by the Respondent, thus no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could be reasonably claimed (see, e.g., *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#)).

The Respondent’s use of the confusingly similar disputed domain name on a website offering overlapping services is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use pursuant to the Policy (see, e.g., *Option One Mortgage Corporation v. Option One Lending*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-1052](#)).

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name reproducing the Complainant's trademark and arranged its redirection to the website prominently featuring the Complainant's trademark and providing a link to the Complainant's website. The Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name and its use confirms the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's prior trademark rights, which confirms the bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

According to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location. In this case, the disputed domain name, confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, redirects to a website featuring the Complainant's trademark and provides advertising links to third party websites with services competing against the Complainant's. The Panel finds the above confirms the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

Moreover, the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letter, and did not provide any good reason to justify this, which confirms the bad faith (see, e.g., *Compagnie Generale des Etablissements Michelin v. Vaclav Novotny*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1022](#)).

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 <babestationapp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: December 22, 2025