

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Uber Technologies, Inc. v. Uber Limousine, Uber Limousine
Case No. D2025-4918

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Uber Technologies, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Uber Limousine, Uber Limousine, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <uberlimousine.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 25, 2025. On November 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 1, 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 (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 2, 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 December 3, 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 December 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent’s default on January 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on January 7, 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 corporation established in Delaware, United States in 2009 that operates a technology platform that offers ridesharing and various delivery services to customers worldwide. It launched a limousine service in the United States in 2010. The Complainant is the proprietor of numerous trademark registrations internationally, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3842416 for UBER CAB (word mark), registered on August 31, 2010 for goods and services in classes 9, 38, 39, and 42;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3977893 for UBER (word mark), registered on June 14, 2011 for goods and services in classes 9, 38, 39, and 42;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 4837495 for UBERX (word mark), registered on October 20, 2015 for goods and services in classes 9, 28, 29, and 42.

The Complainant operates its primary business website at the domain name <uber.com>. It also operates websites at the domain names <ubereats.com>, <uberhealth.com>, and <uberfreight.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 16, 2012. At the time of the Complaint, it resolved to a website labeled “Uber Limousine” stating “UBER Limousine Service Worldwide Chauffeured Transportation Services” above buttons inviting users to “get a quote” or “call us now.”

The record contains evidence that a person associated with the Respondent applied to register the trademark UBER LIMOUSINE in the United States Patent and Trademark Office, for which it received an Office Action in 2017 citing a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s UBERX trademark. The Respondent’s mark was ultimately not granted. The record also indicates that the Complainant has, in 2019 and 2023, filed complaints with registrars concerning the disputed domain name, resulting in the temporary suspension of the Respondent’s website and the Respondent’s moving the disputed domain name to another registrar.

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 its technology is currently available in approximately 70 countries around the world. The Complainant and its subsidiaries had approximately 31,000 employees globally and operations in more than 15,000 cities around the world. As of the year ending December 31, 2024, the Complainant had 171 million monthly active platform consumers and revenue of USD 43.978 billion. At the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant was already valued at USD 330 million, employed 60 people, and operated in approximately 15 cities. The disputed domain name reflects the Complainant’s mark together with the descriptive term “limousine,” which does not mitigate confusing similarity. The Respondent is not authorized by the Complainant to register or use the UBER mark in any manner. The disputed domain name is being used in connection with a transportation service that is the same as the type of service facilitated by the Complainant’s platform, thereby falsely implying an association with the Complainant. The purpose of the disputed domain name is to attempt to attract Internet users for potential gain. The Complainant’s UBER mark is well-known for transportation services. The Respondent’s

conduct in changing Registrars to evade suspension of the disputed domain name is further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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, “limousine”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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 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 notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant's well-known UBER mark together with the descriptive term "limousine," which clearly plays on the mark. The record indicates that the disputed domain name used to resolve to a webpage offering transportation services, which compete with the Complainant's business. Together with the use to which it has been put, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant's business that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering transportation services in direct competition with the Complainant. The Respondent's website does not clarify that it is not operated by the Complainant and there is no information available that would support a finding of fair use by the Respondent. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name is plainly for commercial gain that is not compatible with rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.3.

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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Complainant established rights in its UBER and UBERX marks several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, which reflects the UBER mark in its entirety, together with the term "limousine," which implies a link with the Complainant's transportation platform. On this record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website offering services competing with the Complainant's business is an indication of bad faith use of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5. The Panel further finds that evidence of the Respondent's conduct of responding to registrar take-down notices by moving to another hosting provider additionally supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Respondent has not attempted to provide a good-faith explanation for such conduct and the Panel does not find it likely that one could exist. On this record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <uberlimousine.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: January 21, 2026