

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Townsquare Next, LLC v. Ankit Bansal
Case No. D2025-4794

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Townsquare Next, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Saldaña IP Law, United States.

The Respondent is Ankit Bansal, India, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thexxlmag.com> 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 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 (John Doe) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 1, 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 December 3, 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 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 23, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on December 3, 16, and 18, 2025. On December 26, 2026, the Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing to the Center.¹

¹The Panel notes here that no supplemental filings were requested by the Panel from either Party in this matter. The Panel has not taken into consideration the Complainant’s supplemental filing dated December 26, 2025. Rules, paragraphs 12 and 10.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 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, Townsquare Next, LLC, is a company in the United States, engaged in the publishing of printed magazines and online -publications and related services.

The Complainant is the owner of a number the United States trademark registrations of XXL both as word mark and as figurative mark including registration No. 3,756,582 of the word mark XXL and registration No. 3,756,583 of the figurative mark  both registered on March 9, 2010 for the services "providing on-line publications in the nature of a magazine in the field of hip-hop music and matters relating to the hip hop genre" in international class 41.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <xxlmag.com>, which was registered on June 12, 1998, and connects to its website on which the Complainant publishes its XXL magazine.

The disputed domain name <thexxlmag.com> was registered on August 13, 2022. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the mark "XXLMAG" which appeared in all capital letters in white contained within a red square and the content shown on this website was related to the hip hop genre. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a website stating "this site has been deactivated".

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 the Complainant's trademark XXL, since it contains the mark in its entirety, with the addition of the terms "the" and "mag".

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated nor a licensee, authorized agent by the company to register or use the "XXL" trademark.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, since it is used for a website on which the Respondent is using the logo "XXLMAG" in a stylization that is identical to the stylization of the Complainant's XXL logo.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formalized reply to the Complainant's contentions, but as listed above sent a number of emails, including two emails that informed the Center and the Complainant that the website that was connected to the disputed domain name would be deactivated.

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, “the” and “mag”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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. 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 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 considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or of a service on the Respondent's website. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 <thexxImag.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: January 22, 2026