

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Marlink SA v. Ahmed Ismael

Case No. D2025-5170

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Marlink SA, Belgium, represented by MIIP – MADE IN IP, France.

The Respondent is Ahmed Ismael, United States of America (“US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <globalmarlink.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 December 11, 2025. On December 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 11, 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 12, 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 15, 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 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder as the sole panelist in this matter on January 26, 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, Marlink SA, is a worldwide provider of smart network solutions related to satellite communications, terrestrial telecoms, and digital services.

The Complainant owns and uses the mark MARLINK in connection with its telecommunication and satellite communication services throughout different jurisdictions. The Complainant's mark MARLINK is registered in several jurisdictions and details of some of such trademark registrations are as below:

- MARLINK - European Union Registration No. 015333487, registered on October 4, 2016, in international class 38.
-  - US Registration No. 5483026, registered on June 5, 2018, in international class 38.
-  - European Union Registration No. 015462864, registered on September 16, 2016, in international class 38.

The Complainant operates through its official website "www.marlink.com", which was registered on May 10, 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 23, 2025. The Respondent's website is a single page website, purporting to offer freight services from Egypt under the name Global Maritime Link and the mark Global Link & Device. The Respondent's website, neither provides any contact details nor any details on how to avail the purported services. The social media buttons on the Respondent's website are non-functional.

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 contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark MARLINK. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name incorporates the MARLINK mark in its entirety, with the addition of the descriptive term 'global', which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and instead increases the likelihood of confusion given the Complainant's international operations.

The Complainant asserts that it owns an extensive portfolio of registered trademarks for MARLINK throughout the world, including European Union and US registrations, with first registration dating back to 1996.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no business or legal relationship with the Complainant, and has not been authorised or licensed to use the MARLINK mark. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that appears non-genuine and provides no verifiable contact information.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its well-known MARLINK mark and intentionally sought to take advantage of its reputation. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent activated MX records associated with the disputed domain name, creating a risk of phishing and fraudulent email activity, and used a privacy service to conceal its identity. In light of these circumstances, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Panel finds that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the MARLINK mark, which remains clearly recognisable within the disputed domain name, and that the addition of the descriptive term "global" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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

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 recognised 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 with the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that the Respondent has no relationship whatsoever with the Complainant. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant's business, and has never been authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the MARLINK trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the term "global marlink".

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a clear prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has failed to rebut this prima facie case and has not submitted any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel observes that Respondent's single page website claims to offer freight services under the name Global Maritime Link and the mark Global Link & Device. The website provides no contact information or any details on how Internet users can avail the Respondent's so claimed services. The social media buttons on the website are non-functional. To surmise, the Panel finds that the Respondent's website is a stub and does not genuinely offer the services so claimed. These factors strongly suggest that Respondent's website is not associated with a bona fide business and was created solely to give an appearance of legitimacy. The Panel finds no plausible reason for the Respondent to register and use the disputed domain name.

In addition, the Panel notes that the Respondent has configured MX records for the disputed domain name, enabling the creation of email addresses associated with the disputed domain name. In the absence of any legitimate business activity, this configuration may give rise to a serious risk of deceptive or fraudulent email use, including phishing and impersonation of the Complainant.

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 incorporates the Complainant's distinctive MARLINK mark in its entirety, together with the descriptive term "global", which gives the false impression of an official affiliation with the Complainant. The Panel finds that such a composition is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is connected with the Complainant.

As discussed in the preceding paragraphs, the website appears to have been created to give an appearance of legitimacy rather than offer bona fide services.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has configured MX records for the disputed domain name, enabling the creation of email addresses associated with the disputed domain name. In the absence of any legitimate business activity, the Panel finds that this configuration could create a significant risk of phishing or fraudulent email communications designed to impersonate the Complainant.

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 <globalmarlink.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Shwetasree Majumder/

Shwetasree Majumder

Sole Panelist

Date: February 9, 2026