

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Formula One Licensing B.V. v. Henrique Fernandes
Case No. D2025-4930

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Formula One Licensing B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Sheridans Solicitors, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Henrique Fernandes, Brazil, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mecanica1.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 26, 2025. On November 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 28, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 28, 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 28, 2025. The early Response was filed with the Center on November 28, 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. On December 23, 2025, the Complainant filed an unsolicited Supplemental Filing. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on December 31, 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 a company of the Formula One Group which is a group of companies responsible for the promotion of the Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile (FIA)'s Formula One World Championship ("F1 Championship"), and the exploitation of the related commercial rights. As such, the Complainant is the worldwide proprietor of the group's trade mark portfolio relating to F1 Championship races. The F1 Championship attracts a global audience of billions, is broadcast in over 180 countries, and enjoys a vast social media following.

The Complainant is the owner of many trade mark registrations worldwide including or consisting of F1 including:

- Benelux trade mark registration for F1 (word mark), with registration No. 1008618 and with a registration date of January 30, 2017;
- European Union Trade Mark registration for F1 (word mark), with registration No. 009250721 and with a registration date of October 28, 2012; and
- United States of America trade mark registration for F1 (device)  , with registration No. 7630271 and with a registration date of December 31, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2025. It points to a website relating to car mechanics and related services. At the time of filing of the Complaint the website did not contain any disclaimer relating to the relationship with the Complainant (or rather the absence of relationship) and it displayed the Complainant's F1 logo (in a different colour) as a favicon to the website and a nearly identical logo prominently on the website itself.

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 well-known F1 trade mark of the Complainant and that the mere addition of the descriptive term "mecanica" does not act to prevent a finding of such confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that there is no relationship, connection and/or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent which would provide any rights, licenses and/or permissions which would entitle the Respondent to incorporate, and use, the F1 trade mark in the disputed domain name. The Complainant adds that it is evident that the website associated with the disputed domain name does not correspond to a legitimate noncommercial use, or fair use, and that the disputed domain name is used by the Respondent in an effort to generate undue commercial gain by false association with the Complainant.

Turning to bad faith, the Complainant asserts that the registration and use of the disputed domain name incorporating the F1 trade mark of the Complainant is an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, users to the website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's F1 trade mark as to the

source, affiliation and/or endorsement of the website or of a product or service on the website. The Complainant considers that it is not conceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name given the renown of the Complainant's trade mark and the fact that the Respondent's trading services are in the automobile sector in a country where the Brazilian Grand Prix is a well-known Championship which has been held in Brazil for decades. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent has designed its website in a way that suggests an affiliation with the Complainant and without any disclaimer on the absence of relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant also points to the fact that it did put the Respondent on express notice of its trade mark rights before filing the Complaint, to no avail.

B. Respondent

The Respondent filed an early Response on November 28, 2025. In its email communication to the Center on December 23, 2025, the Respondent confirmed that the early Response dated November 28, 2025, should be treated as the final Response.

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent essentially contends that:

- It is a web designer who has designed the website associated with the disputed domain name for its client who owns and operates a small, local car repair shop in Brazil.
- The Respondent and its client acted in good faith with no intention of suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant.
- The term F1 corresponds to the first letter of its client's first name and the number "1" is commonly used in nicknames in Brazil.
- The Respondent has taken good faith corrective actions, including (i) accepts to add a disclaimer on the lack of relationship with the Complainant or its group (ii) removing visual elements that could cause confusion with the Complainant's branding from the website under the disputed domain name.

Turning to the Respondent's claim that the disputed domain name was registered on behalf of an owner of a car repair business connected to the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that there is no evidence on the existence and nature of any relationship between the listed registrant and the alleged beneficial holder. The Panel considers in these circumstances that the Registrar-disclosed registrant, Henrique Fernandes, is the proper Respondent in these proceedings.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue – Admissibility of Supplemental Filings

Under the Rules, no express provision is made for supplemental filings by either Party, except in response to a deficiency notification or if requested by the Center or the Panel. Paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules in effect grant the Panel sole discretion to determine the admissibility of unsolicited supplemental filings.

Admissibility of supplemental filings is to be assessed based on relevance and foreseeability (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.6).

The Panel admits the Supplemental Filings from the Complainant and the Respondent given that they were filed only one day after the due date for the Response and the Complainant addressed a new issue raised in the Respondent's Response to which the Respondent merely responded. In any event, for completeness, the Supplemental Filings have not affected the Panel's conclusion in these administrative proceedings.

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 a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the F1 trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "mecanica", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 that (i) the favicon of the website to which the disputed domain name directs was identical to the Complainant's F1 logo (albeit using a different colour), (ii) the website of the Respondent displayed prominently a logo nearly identical to the Complainant's and in the same black colour – which the Respondent replaced with a differently stylized logo after having been put on notice of this dispute – and did not contain any disclaimer relating to the absence of relationship with the Complainant, and (iii) the Respondent's Response, including the attempt to justify the use of the term "F1", on balance, is not credible and appears to be merely a far-fetched explanation reverse-engineered to fit the composition of the disputed domain name (and, in any case, the use of the Complainant's logo signals an intention to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name). Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case.

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 disputed domain name reproduces the F1 trade mark of the Complainant with the mere addition of the generic term “mecanica” to offer car repair services. On balance, the overall circumstances of the present case including: (i) the renown of the F1 trade mark, as recognized by previous panels under the Policy, (ii) the fact that the Respondent operates in the automobile industry, (iii) the fact that the disputed domain name was registered many years after the registration of the F1 trade mark, and (iv) the manner in which the disputed domain name is used, as described above, indicate awareness and targeting of the Complainant.

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As for the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name is used in bad faith.

Here the Panel considers that the Respondent has unequivocally sought to create confusion with the Complainant, through the disputed domain name coupled with the website associated therewith including as it displayed a favicon and logo nearly identical to the Complainant’s F1 logo registered as a trade mark. In the present case, the disputed domain name is used to attract Internet users by taking unfair advantage of and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trade mark.

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 <mecanicaf1.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: January 14, 2026