

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Virgin Enterprises Limited v. Gaurav Singh
Case No. D2025-4834

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Virgin Enterprises Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Venner Shipley LLP, UK.

The Respondent is Gaurav Singh, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <virgingalactics.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 20, 2025. On November 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 22, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) 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 amendment to the Complaint on November 24, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 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 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on December 26, 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 part of the Virgin Group of companies. It owns the VIRGIN trade mark and associated trade marks. The VIRGIN brand was originally established by Sir Richard Branson, when he started a business selling popular music records by mail order. Since then, the VIRGIN-branded business has expanded significantly and span a diverse range of sectors covering financial services, health and wellness, music and entertainment, telecommunications and media, travel and leisure, and space. There are currently 40 VIRGIN-branded business with tens of millions of customers worldwide and an employ of more than 60,000 people across multiple business sectors and five continents.

The Complainant owns a substantial portfolio of approximately 3,500 trademark applications and registrations in over 150 countries for the VIRGIN trade mark and VIRGIN signature logo (the “VIRGIN Logo”). The VIRGIN and VIRGIN logo trade marks have been intensively used across all VIRGIN operations since the late 1970s. The Complainant’s trademark registrations include:

- (i) UK Trademark Registration No. 3163127 for the VIRGIN Logo, filed on May 5, 2016;
- (ii) UK Trademark Registration No. 904756921 for VIRGIN GALACTIC, filed on December 1, 2005;
- (iii) UK Trademark Registration No. 3163121 for VIRGIN, filed on May 5, 2016;
- (iv) European Union Registration No. 4756921 for VIRGIN GALACTIC, filed on December 1, 2005; and
- (v) United States of America Registration No. 4481359 for VIRGIN GALACTIC, filed on January 20, 2010.

The Complainant has built up a considerable online presence and is the registered proprietor of over 7,000 domain names which consist of or incorporate the VIRGIN trademark. The Complainant has operated its website at “www.virgin.com” since 2000 to promote the activities of the VIRGIN Group and its businesses, ventures and foundations.

The Complainant’s businesses under the VIRGIN branding operate on various social media platforms where the VIRGIN trademarks feature prominently. Collectively, these social media platforms receive over tens of millions of views each year.

The Virgin Group established Virgin Galactic in 2004, the aim of which is to develop space vehicles, promote space tourism, and undertake space science exploration. Virgin Galactic made its first test flight in 2010. The Virgin Galactic projects are promoted extensively on social media and the VIRGIN GALACTIC trade mark is consistently used on all social media and marketing materials. On July 11, 2021, Virgin Galactic made its inaugural passenger flight into space with Sir Richard Branson and three other passengers on board. This event was widely reported in the media around the world. Many people have since already purchased seats on board space flights to be operated by the Virgin Galactic space project.

The Virgin group launched its first passenger and cargo airlines in 1984 under the VIRGIN ATLANTIC trade mark. The Virgin Atlantic Cargo service began between London and New York and now offers cargo flight services internationally, to India, Africa, the Middle East, America, and the Caribbean. Virgin Atlantic Cargo also operates a state-of-the-art facility for processing and storing cargo shipments at London Heathrow Airport. By virtue of the continuous high-profile use, the Complainant’s VIRGIN trade mark has acquired significant reputation and goodwill in relation to cargo and freight services.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 19, 2025. At the time of filing the Complainant, it resolved to a website that purports to offer “import & export, heritage & antiques auctions, renewable energy & solar power, radioactive material transport, radiation safety, and environmental protection” under the name “Virgin Galactic”.

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 incorporates the terms “virgin” and “galactic” with an additional “s” at the end. It therefore incorporates the Complainant’s registered marks VIRGIN and VIRGIN GALATIC in their entirety. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s VIRGIN GALATIC trade mark, being almost identical thereto, save for the single “s”.

Further, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s website identifies itself as “Virgin Galactic”, thereby using a mark identical to the Complainant’s registered VIRGIN GALACTIC trade mark, purportedly to offer various cargo and related services, which are identical and similar to the services which the Complainant has a reputation in. The Respondent’s website also uses the Complainant’s VIRGIN Logo. Notably, in several places on the Respondent’s website, there are sections of text which contain errors; there are hyperlinks which do not redirect anywhere; it provides an address which is the headquarters of the Virgin Galactic business but the email contact provided is fraudulent and the phone number provided shows an area code for eastern Nebraska, which is not where Virgin Galactic operates; the “Contact” section on the Respondent’s website provides a form that requests Internet users to enter personal information. There is no evidence that the disputed domain name is intended to be used in relation to a bona fide genuine business offering. Neither is there evidence that the Respondent has ever been known as “Virgin Galactic” or “Virgin Galactics”. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant’s registered marks.

Lastly, the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The Respondent purports by its website to offer cargo, courier, freight and related services, and this is clearly done to deceive consumers into thinking that the website is operated by or connected to the Complainant. The fact that Internet users will not be able to obtain reliable information by accessing the Respondent’s website or filling out the “Contact” form, is likely to divert actual or prospective consumers away from the Complainant’s VIRGIN businesses. It is also likely to tarnish the reputation of the Complainant’s registered marks. It is highly unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant at the time the disputed domain name was registered. The Respondent has therefore intentionally registered the disputed domain name to attract Internet users and deceive them into believing that the Respondent’s website is connected to, authorized by, or endorsed by the Complainant. The “Contact” form may also be used by the Respondent to obtain sensitive or personal data from Internet users.

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 VIRGIN GALACTIC mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, except that the disputed domain name contains an additional letter "s" at the end of the word "galactic". This is a minor difference which Internet users may not even notice at first glance, and which also lends itself to a foreseeable situation of inadvertent typo errors being made when searching for the Complainant's website based on the name "Virgin Galactic". 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 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

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Panels have also found the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark: (i) seeking to cause confusion for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, (ii) the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, and (iii) absence of any conceivable good faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation/passing off or phishing constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

It is obvious in this case that the Respondent knew of the Complainant, its businesses, and its trade marks, and deliberately targeted them. The Complainant and its trademarks are without doubt internationally well known, with a tremendous level of goodwill and reputation. It is not conceivable how the Respondent would be able to explain his choice of the disputed domain name and manner of use of the Complainant's registered trade marks, which is infringing in nature. The use of the VIRGIN and VIRGIN Logo marks on the Respondent's website and deliberate typosquatted spelling of the widely-known VIRGIN GALACTIC mark in the disputed domain name, the common area of commerce and intended consumers (namely, for cargo, courier, freight and related services), and the clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the domain name, are all indicia of bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1

The Panel therefore 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 <virgingalactics.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/

Francine Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: January 5, 2026