

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hillel: The Foundation For Jewish Campus Life v. Chong Man Wai, kps  
Case No. D2025-4793

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hillel: The Foundation For Jewish Campus Life, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Irwin IP LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Chong Man Wai, kps, Malaysia.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <askbigquestions.org> 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 18, 2025. On November 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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, Domains by Proxy, LLC) 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 24, 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 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres 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 a Jewish campus organization, supporting students at over 850 colleges and universities across more than 16 countries. In 2007, the Complainant's Northwestern University chapter founded an initiative named "Ask Big Questions", which grew to a national initiative of the Complainant in the United States focusing on helping colleges, universities, and organizations engage students in asking questions and having conversations that lead to meaningful discussions. This initiative has assisted over 300,000 people by training numerous student leaders, faculty, and staff on 175 campuses.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3787908 for ASKBIGQUESTIONS.ORG in class 42, having a registration date of May 11, 2010, and a first use date of October 15, 2007
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3787907 for ASKBIGQUESTIONS in class 42, having a registration date of May 11, 2010, and a first use date of October 15, 2007

The disputed domain name was registered on August 29, 2007, and currently resolves to a webserver parking page. The Complainant's evidence establishes that the Complainant used the disputed domain name from at least as early as 2011 for the website of its ASKBIGQUESTIONS initiative, and that the Complainant inadvertently allowed the disputed domain name to lapse. The Complainant's evidence further establishes that the disputed domain name resolved to a website entitled "MUVIPRO" in September 2025, offering movie streaming and gambling services targeted at Indonesian users.

#### **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 was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's ASKBIGQUESTIONS mark for the Respondent's commercial gain.

##### **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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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.

For the reasons discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name in these circumstances cannot represent a *bona fide* offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1981](#).

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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant’s mark for the Respondent’s commercial gain, falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel has independently established, using publicly available domain name sales history records, that the disputed domain name was sold in October 2024 through a Registrar expired domain name auction. This corresponds with: a) Internet Archive records showing that the disputed domain name began resolving to a website targeting Indonesian users, offering gambling services, in November 2024, after having resolved to the Complainant’s ASKBIGQUESTIONS website prior to that; and b) an update to the Whois records for

the disputed domain name on October 13, 2024, evidencing a name server change.<sup>1</sup> This all points to it being likely that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in October 2024 after the Complainant allowed it to lapse.

Internet search results for the Complainant's mark and the second-level portion of the disputed domain name are dominated by results relating to the Complainant's initiative. The Panel accepts that the Complainant's ASKBIGQUESTIONS mark enjoys goodwill and a reputation.

The Respondent's registration of a ".org" domain name points to targeting of the Complainant. The ".org" Top-Level Domain ("TLD") is commonly associated with non-profit and community organizations such as the Complainant, and the disputed domain name itself would appear to be associated with the Complainant; Internet searches for the full disputed domain name in the form of "askbigquestions.org" return results overwhelmingly relating to the Complainant.

Bad faith is also indicated by the complete dissonance between the composition of the disputed domain name on the one hand and the use to which the Respondent put the disputed domain name, i.e., for gambling and movie streaming services, on the other hand. The title of the Respondent's erstwhile website was "MUVIPRO" and only a cursory, single instance of "ASKBIGQUESTIONS" was used in a very inconspicuous place low down on the website. Without any meaningful explanation from the Respondent, this dissonance calls the Respondent's intentions for the disputed domain name into question.

The Panel has independently established that the Respondent has previously been found to have contravened the Policy in similar circumstances to the present. See *VFS Global Services PLC v. Chong Man Wai, kps*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4483](#). This case would appear to be a continuation of the Respondent's cybersquatting modus operandi.

The Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent's failure to take part in the present proceeding where an explanation is certainly called for. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at section 4.3.

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 <askbigquestions.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

**Jeremy Speres**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 16, 2026

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with its powers articulated *inter alia* in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.