

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Namecheap, Inc. v. Muteeb Shera
Case No. D2025-4989

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Namecheap, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Rome LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Muteeb Shera, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <namecheapro.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 1, 2025. On December 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On December 2, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 4, 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 4, 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 Respondent's default on January 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on January 9, 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 one of the leading ICANN-accredited domain name registrar and web-hosting company based in Phoenix, Arizona, United States. It was founded in 2000 and since that date has continuously used the trademarks NAMECHEAP and NAMECHEAP.COM in commerce. It now has over 20 million domain names under management.

The Complainant is the proprietor of a substantial number of registered trademarks around the world in respect of NAMECHEAP and NAMECHEAP.COM, including United States trademark number 4213990, NAMECHEAP, registered on September 25, 2012; United Kingdom trademark number 3593968, NAMECHEAP, registered on August 13, 2021; and European Union trademark number 18412308, NAMECHEAP, registered on September 8, 2021.

The Domain Name was registered on August 7, 2025. It does not currently resolve to an active website, but the Complainant has adduced evidence that at the time of preparation of the Complaint the Domain Name resolved to a commercial website branded as "NameCheapo Hosting". It offered domain name registration and a full suite of web-hosting services, including Shared Hosting, WordPress Hosting, VPS Hosting, Dedicated Hosting, Cloud Hosting, and Email Hosting, together with related support services. The site repeatedly used "NameCheapo" as the source-identifying brand, featured a domain-search tool, and promoted fast, reliable hosting, 100 percent uptime, and 24/7 support, mirroring the Complainant's core registrar and hosting offerings and directly competing in the same marketplace.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its NAMECHEAP trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been 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 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy through its registered trademarks for NAMECHEAP (the "Mark") in multiple jurisdictions. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", the Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the letters "ro". The Panel finds that the addition of these letters does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but for a website that features a minor variation of the Mark and purporting to offer services directly competing with those of the Complainant. There is no suggestion that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name and the Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant to use the Mark. The Respondent has chosen not to respond to the Complaint or to take any steps to counter the prima facie case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

In addition, the nature of the Domain Name together with the Respondent's website create a strong risk of Internet user confusion.

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 Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of the letters "ro". Further, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website featuring a minor

variation of the Mark and purporting to offer services directly competing with those of the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel considers that the Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark. In the Panel's view, the use of the Domain Name for such activity, clearly with a view to commercial gain, amounts to paradigm bad faith registration and use for the purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Domain Name <namecheapro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026