

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Your Golf Travel Limited v. Lewis Remington, Golfholidaysdirect
Case No. D2025-4974

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Your Golf Travel Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Keystone Law, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Lewis Remington, Golfholidaysdirect, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mygolftravel.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 28, 2025. On December 1, 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 Respondent sent an email to the Center. On December 2, 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, DomainsbyProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 3, 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 8, 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 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 29, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 9 and 15, 2025.

The Center appointed David Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on January 20, 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 Your Golf Travel Limited; a limited liability company registered in England and Wales. The Complainant offers golf holidays and travel and related services such as air travel, car hire, airport transfers, hotel accommodation, and golf course bookings in the United Kingdom and across Europe. The Complainant was incorporated in 2004 and has traded since 2005 via its website at the domain name <yourgolftravel.com> and by telephone.

The Complaint is the owner of United Kingdom Trademark No. UK00905955034, YOUR GOLF TRAVEL, Registered on April 15, 2008.

The Respondent is Mr. Lewis Remington, Director of Golf Holidays Direct Limited. It appears that the Respondent was employed by the Complainant from February 2012 until he was dismissed for suspected fraud and theft of customer email addresses in June 2017. The Complainant brought High Court proceedings for an injunction against Mr. Remington and Golf Holidays Direct Limited, obtaining undertakings not to use or disclose confidential information. Further legal proceedings were initiated for continued use of stolen customer email addresses. The Respondent subsequently established Golf Holidays Direct Limited, which was sold in January 2025 to Sports Tours International, although Mr. Remington retains a small minority shareholding.

The disputed domain name was first registered on April 11, 2008. The Respondent purchased the disputed domain name in 2019. Around March 2019, the disputed domain name was used to host a single page offering golf holidays, with the phone number for Golf Holidays Direct Limited displayed.

On March 21, 2019, the Respondent's solicitors offered to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for GBP 25,000, claiming these were "incurred set-up expenses". Later, on May 10, 2019, the demand increased to GBP 50,000. The disputed domain name was also offered for sale to a competitor, as evidenced by an email from Mr. Remington to a third party dated March 12, 2019. In November 2025, the disputed domain name was offered for sale via a GoDaddy.com parking page with a "buy now" price of GBP 75,958.15.

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.

The Complainant asserts rights in the trademark YOUR GOLF TRAVEL. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark, the only difference being the first word, both being possessive pronouns, which are easily mistaken for each other.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent, through its director Mr. Remington, was previously employed by the Complainant and was dismissed for suspected fraud and theft of customer email addresses. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark and business before acquiring the disputed domain name and has been using the disputed domain name to misrepresent its services as those of the Complainant. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has not built up any reputation or goodwill in the disputed domain name and only used it to attempt to divert enquiries and to sell it to the Complainant and its competitors.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name primarily to sell it to the Complainant or its competitors for amounts far exceeding out-of-pocket costs, as evidenced by correspondence offering the domain for GBP 25,000, then GBP 50,000, and later listing it for GBP 75,958.15. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has also attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent's director used customer email addresses that had been misappropriated from the Complainant in order to benefit from the Complainant's goodwill, thereby using the disputed domain name to mislead users and for improper commercial advantage.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent argues that the disputed domain incorporates generic terms in a distinct format ("my + golf travel"), which is clearly distinguishable from the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent also notes that the Complainant's trademark consists entirely of generic and descriptive terms, and that the descriptive nature of the mark limits its enforceability, especially as it does not cover the specific format "my + [golf term]".

The Respondent asserts legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, supported by prior business operations, a longstanding pattern of registering descriptive golf-travel domain names, intended use for an independent, community-focused forum for golfers, and prior legitimate use of the disputed domain name as a golf holiday site in 2021. The Respondent emphasizes that the disputed domain name has never been used to target or exploit the Complainant or its business, and that registration and intended use align with good-faith commercial practices and are consistent with UDRP provisions for legitimate interests in descriptive domain names.

The Respondent maintains that there is no evidence of bad faith. The Respondent claims that the disputed domain name was not registered to interfere with the Complainant's rights. Prior use by unrelated companies, including during periods when the Complainant was actively operating, demonstrates that the disputed domain name is generic and has historically been used in the industry. The Respondent's registration and use reflect legitimate descriptive practice. The Respondent also points to the Complainant's history of aggressive legal action and overreaching conduct, which further diminishes the credibility of its claim.

The Respondent requests that the Complaint be denied.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate on the balance of probabilities that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (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 disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark YOUR GOLF TRAVEL, the registration details of which are set out in the factual background above.

The disputed domain name incorporates the portion “golf travel” from the Complainant’s YOUR GOLF TRAVEL trademark, with the only difference being the substitution of the possessive pronoun “your” with “my”. The remainder of the disputed domain name, “golf travel”, corresponds to the relevant portion of the Complainant’s trademark. The Panel considers that the substitution of a common pronoun at the beginning of the disputed domain name does not prevent the Complainant’s mark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark YOUR GOLF TRAVEL.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The factual record indicates that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in 2019, well after the Complainant had established its business and trademark rights in YOUR GOLF TRAVEL. The Respondent was previously employed by the Complainant and subsequently became involved in a competing business, Golf Holidays Direct Limited. The disputed domain name was used to promote golf holiday services, which are directly competitive with the Complainant’s offerings. The use of the disputed domain name, being confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, to offer services identical or highly similar to those of the Complainant, does not in the Panel’s view amount to use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent attempts to support its case on the basis that the disputed domain name consists entirely of generic and descriptive terms. However, the Panel cannot disregard the rest of the circumstances of the case, particularly that the Respondent had a business relationship with the Complainant, which was terminated prior to the Respondent’s acquisition of the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that the registration of a disputed domain name, even when it consists of a combination of dictionary terms, would not support a respondent’s claim to a right or legitimate interest if the overall circumstances lead to a finding of targeting of the complainant. The Panel considers that this is a case of cybersquatting, as further discussed under the third element, and that the Respondent was aware of the similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark, as well as the inherent risk of confusion arising from such similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10.1.

While the Respondent may have established independent brand identity in “Golf Holidays Direct”, the Panel finds that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The record does not support a finding that the Respondent is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name has been manifestly commercial in nature, including promoting competing services and offering the disputed domain name for sale at substantial prices. The Respondent’s contention of an intended use as an independent, community-focused forum for golfers is not supported by evidence. While the Respondent provides evidence of a blog posting golf destinations as per a Web Archive screenshot dated December 1, 2013, the Panel notes that the Respondent confirmed the acquisition of the disputed domain name in 2019, which makes any prior use irrelevant for the purposes of evidencing the Respondent’s intention towards the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. 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.

As noted above, the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in 2019, after having been employed by the Complainant. The Respondent subsequently used the disputed domain name to promote golf holiday services, which directly compete with the Complainant's business. The composition of the disputed domain name closely resembles the Complainant's trademark and official domain name. Given the use to which the disputed domain name has been put, the Panel considers that Internet users were likely to have been misled into believing that the disputed domain name was operated by or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant. The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent 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, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent refers to a prior case filed by the Complainant which resulted in a denial, *Your Golf Travel Limited v. Hardelet Holidays Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1058](#). However, there are clear differences with the case at hand, particularly noting the prior relationship between the parties, terminated at the time of the Respondent's acquisition of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent claims that the disputed domain name was purchased for a "five figure amount"; however, that claim is not supported in evidence. Not long after acquiring the disputed domain name, the Respondent offered it for sale to the Complainant for a substantial sum, initially GBP 25,000 and later GBP 50,000. The disputed domain name was also offered for sale to a competitor and was listed for sale at an even higher price via a domain parking service. These actions are consistent with conduct intended to profit from the Complainant's established reputation and goodwill.

The Respondent's prior employment, knowledge of the Complainant's business, and involvement in legal disputes concerning confidential information reinforce the inference that the registration and use of the disputed domain name were motivated by an intent to disrupt the Complainant's business or to leverage its goodwill for improper commercial advantage. The Panel finds that these circumstances, taken together, demonstrate that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. 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 <mygolftravel.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/David Taylor/

David Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: February 20, 2026