

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Feyza Sütlü v. Akhmet Soslanov

Case No. D2025-4994

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Feyza Sütlü, Germany, represented by Weber-Sauberschwarz, Germany.

The Respondent is Akhmet Soslanov, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <ivana-models-escortservice.info> and <ivana-models-escortservice.online> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with Registrar of Domain Names REG.RU LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 2, 2025. On December 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On December 4, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown (data redacted for privacy)) 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 amended Complaint in English on December 8, 2025.

On December 4, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Russian and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Names is Russian. On December 8, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Russian and English 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 December 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on January 6, 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 has operated an escort service under the domain name <ivana-models-escortservice.de> since 2017.

The Complainant is the owner of the European Union Trade Mark Registration for IVANA MODELS (word) No. 018457676, registered on August 13, 2021.

The Domain Names were registered on July 24, 2024.

At the time the Complaint was filed, and as of the date of this decision, the Domain Names resolve to virtually identical websites offering escort services in various countries, including where the Complainant offers its services (the "Websites"). The Websites have the same look and feel as the Complainant's website.

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 Domain Names.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue – Language of Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Names is Russian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and the amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons. First, the Complainant argues that the Websites associated with the Domain Names are entirely in English, not in Russian. Second, the Complainant claims that the Respondent uses a British telephone number for WhatsApp contact, and the service fees are stated in EUR. Third, the Complainant states that the services are offered in multiple countries in the European Union and not in the Russian Federation. Fourth, the Complainant notes that the Domain Names are composed of English terms, namely “models” and “escort service.” Finally, the Complainant submits that requiring a Russian translation of the Complaint would cause undue delay in the proceedings.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties’ ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. See section 4.5.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”).

The Panel finds that substantial additional expense and delay would likely be incurred if the Complaint had to be translated into Russian. Moreover, the Panel notes that the Respondent did not comment or let alone object to the Complainant’s request concerning the language of the proceedings.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues – Three Elements

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) the Domain Names are 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 the Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The requested remedy may only be granted if the above criteria are met. At the outset, the Panel notes that the applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”. See section 4.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant holds valid registration for the IVANA MODELS trademark. The Domain Names incorporate this trademark in its entirety. As numerous UDRP panels have held, incorporating a trademark in its entirety is sufficient to establish that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark (see *PepsiCo, Inc. v. PEPSI, SRL (a/k/a P.E.P.S.I.) and EMS COMPUTER INDUSTRY (a/k/a EMS)*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0696](#)).

The addition of hyphens and the term “escort service” in the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the IVANA MODELS trademark. Panels have consistently held that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the

addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs”) “.info” and “.online” in the Domain Names are viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such are typically disregarded under the first element test. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s IVANA MODELS trademark for purposes of the Policy. In sum, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Names may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

- (i) that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the Domain Names or a name corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Names, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names without intent for commercial gain to mislead consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

In the present case, the Complainant’s IVANA MODELS trademark registration predates the Respondent’s registration of the Domain Names. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the IVANA MODELS trademark or to register the Domain Names incorporating this trademark.

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names. At the time the Complaint was filed, and as of the date of this decision, the Domain Names resolve to the Websites offering escort services, which are the same services as those offered by the Complainant and the Websites have the same look and feel as the Complainant’s website. Such use of the Domain Names cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Given the above, there are no circumstances in evidence which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in respect of the Domain Names. Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant’s *prima facie* case. In sum, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided it is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

As indicated above, the Complainant's rights in the IVANA MODELS trademark predate the registration of the Domain Names. This Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the Domain Names. This finding is supported by the inclusion of the entirety of the IVANA MODELS trademark in the Domain Names, as well as their subsequent use for the Websites offering escort services that are same to those provided by the Complainant. In sum, the Panel considers that the Respondent registered the Domain Names with the expectation of taking advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's IVANA MODELS trademark.

Next, the Domain Names have also been used by the Respondent in bad faith. As noted above, at the time the Complaint was filed, and as of the date of this decision, the Domain Names are being used by the Respondent to attract Internet users to the Websites purporting to offer IVANA MODELS branded escort services in various countries, including where the Complainant offers its services. There is little doubt that the Respondent intends to earn profit from the confusion created with Internet users. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is deliberately using the Domain Names in order to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation for its own benefit.

For the reasons discussed above, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Names <ivana-models-escortservice.info> and <ivana-models-escortservice.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/

Piotr Nowaczyk

Sole Panelist

Date: January 20, 2026