

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CWI, LLC v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC

Case No. D2025-4821

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CWI, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Neal & McDevitt, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <campingworldrvsale.com>, and <campingworldrvssales.com> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 19, 2025. On November 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <campingworldrvsale.com>. On November 21, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <campingworldrvsale.com> which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 24, 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.

On December 2, 2025, the Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint requesting addition of the disputed domain name <campingworldrvssales.com> to the proceeding. On December 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <campingworldrvssales.com>. On December 3, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and the amendment to the 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 proceeding commenced on December 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on January 5, 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a leading retailer of recreational vehicles in the United States, founded in the 1960s, and operating under the trade marks CAMPING WORLD and CAMPING WORLD RV SALES (the “Trade Mark(s)”).

The Complainant is the owner of United States registration No. 930,179 for the CAMPING WORLD Trade Mark, with a registration date of February 29, 1972; and United States registration No. 7,391,946 for the CAMPING WORLD RV SALES Trade Mark, with a registration date of May 21, 2024.

The Complainant also operates the following websites for its business activities: “www.campingworld.com”, and “www.campingworldrvsales.com”.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is apparently an entity located in Saint Kitts and Nevis.

C. The Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain names <campingworldrvsale.com> and <campingworldrvssales.com> were registered on November 11, 2025, and November 24, 2025, respectively.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain names were previously resolved to the same English language website (the “Website”) featuring prominently the Trade Marks, purportedly offering for sale recreational vehicles at heavily discounted prices, and displaying the copyright notice “Copyright Camping | World RV Sales | 2025”.

At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain names no longer resolve to an active website.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names, in bad faith, in order to pass off the Website as a website of, or authorised or approved by, the Complainant. The Complainant has also submitted evidence to demonstrate that the contact address on the Website is not genuine, but instead relates to the address of an abandoned and vacant plot.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the Trade Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Trade Marks are recognizable within the disputed domain names. The entirety of the CAMPING WORLD Trade Mark is reproduced in the disputed domain names; and the disputed domain names additionally consist of misspellings of the CAMPING WORLD RV SALES Trade Mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (as applicable to this case: the claimed impersonation/passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 light of the manner of registration and use of the disputed domain names, the Panel finds that the requisite element of bad faith has been made out pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (as applicable to this case: the claimed impersonation/passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The fact that the Websites have been taken down following the filing of the Complaint provides further support for a finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, 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 names <campingworldrvsale.com> and <campingworldrvssales.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: January 15, 2026