ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Md. Akhtarujjaman
Case No. D2025-5186

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL c/o Walters Law Group, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Md. Akhtarujjaman, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <agesmart-refund-megapersonals.com> and <megapersonaaalse.com> are registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 11, 2025, in relation to the disputed domain name <agesmart-refund-megapersonals.com>. On December 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 16, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 16, 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 17, 2025, adding the disputed domain name <megapersonaaalse.com> to the proceeding, whose registrant and contact information is confirmed by the Registrar to be the same as the other disputed domain name.

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 proceeding commenced on December 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 13, 2026.

The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on December 23, 2025, and January 31, 2026. On December 28, 2025, the Complainant requested suspension of the proceeding to explore settlement discussions. The Complainant requested the Center to reinstitute the proceeding on February 3, 2026. On February 17, 2026, the Center notified the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a company providing Internet-based social introduction and dating services under the trade mark MEGAPERSONALS (the "Trade Mark") via its websites at "www.megapersonals.com" (since 2004) and "www.megapersonals.eu" (since June 2020).

The Complainant is the owner of United States registration No.6,432,591 for the Trade Mark, with a registration date of July 27, 2021.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is reportedly an individual located in Bangladesh.

C. The Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain name <megapersonaaalse.com> was registered on August 19, 2025.

The disputed domain name <agesmart-refund-megapersonals.com> was registered on August 24, 2025.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain name <megapersonaaalse.com> was previously resolved to an English language website, prominently featuring the Trade Mark and using the same corporate livery used by the Complainant on its website, containing a copyright notice referring to the Complainant's <megapersonals.eu> domain name, and inviting users to click on an icon and enter their personal email and password in order to purportedly register for personal classifieds.

The disputed domain name <agesmart-refund-megapersonals.com> was previously resolved to an English language website, also prominently featuring the Trade Mark and using the same corporate livery used by the Complainant on its website, and inviting users to click on an icon in order to purportedly register for a refund.

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain names are no longer resolved to any active websites.

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 Respondent has used the disputed domain names illegitimately, in order to impersonate the Complainant, and engage in unlawful phishing.

B. Respondent

The Respondent claimed to have registered the disputed domain names on behalf of a client and that it did not control the client's activities. The Respondent further stated in its email that its client has agreed to the transfer of the disputed domain names.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), 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 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The disputed domain name <megapersonaaalse.com> consists of a misspelling of the Trade Mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

In respect of the disputed domain name <agesmart-refund-megapersonals.com>, although the addition of other terms (here, "age smart" and "refund") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, 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 that 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 3.1, 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <agesmart-refund-megapersonals.com> and <megapersonaaalse.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/
Sebastian M.W. Hughes
Sole Panelist
Date: March 6, 2026