ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. kaijian tao
Case No. D2025-5274

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), Switzerland, represented by K&L Gates, Australia.

The Respondent is kaijian tao, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <buyfifacoins.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") 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 17, 2025. On December 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On December 17, 2026, 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 DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 19, 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 21, 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 January 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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 is the world governing body of football (soccer) and the organizer of major international football tournaments including the FIFA World Cup, FIFA Women's World Cup, FIFA Club World Cup, and FIFA Beach Soccer World Cup.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the term FIFA worldwide, including for example International Trademark No. 633108 for FIFA (word mark), registered on February 22, 1995, for goods in classes 25 and 28 with protection in multiple jurisdictions including China. These trademarks are referred to as the "FIFA trademark" in this decision.

The Complainant operates the website at <www.fifa.com> which provides information about its tournaments, activities, and the sport of football, as well as an online store, streaming channel, ticketing services, and a digital collectibles platform.

For the 2019-2022 financial period, the Complainant's revenue totaled USD 7.6 billion.

The Disputed Domain Name was created on January 21, 2013. According to historical WhoIs records, the Disputed Domain Name was transferred to the current Respondent, Kaijian Tao, on January 5, 2016. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website (the "Respondent's Website") offering for sale virtual in-game tokens/currency used in football-related video games. In particular it appears to offer for sale what are described as "FC26 coins"

From 1993 to 2022, the Complainant licensed EA Sports to produce video games using the Complainant's intellectual property, which used the name "FIFA" in their titles. In EA Sports' games, in-game tokens or currency included "FC Coins", "FUT Coins", and "FIFA Points" – but not "FIFA Coins". "Points" could be purchased from EA Sports, but "Coins"" could only be earned through gameplay or trading. EA Sports specifically prohibited buying coins from third parties.

Since 2022, EA Sports has no longer been licensed by the Complainant, and the games have been renamed "EA Sports FC", with "FIFA Points" now called "FC Points". EA Sports current games utilize FC26 coins as in game tokens.

The Respondent provided a declaration on behalf of the respondent in a previous UDRP case involving the domain name <fifacoin.com> (*Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. MATE SERVICE CO., LIMITED,* WIPO Case No. D2025-2342), in which the panel ordered transfer to the Complainant. The Respondent's Website states that it is operated by MATE SERVICE CO., LIMITED which is the company that was the respondent in D2025-2342.

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 as follows.

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FIFA trademark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the FIFA trademark with the addition of the descriptive terms "buy" and "coins", which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not authorized or licensed by the Complainant. The Respondent's website features a business providing automated sales of virtual in-game tokens for commercial gain. Even during the period when EA Sports was licensed by the Complainant to produce video games, in-game currencies were never called "FIFA Coins". Moreover, EA Sports' license terminated in 2022, and third-party platforms offering coins for sale were specifically prohibited by EA Sports.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Disputed Domain Name was registered many years after the Complainant's FIFA trademark became famous worldwide. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a business designed to earn profit from transactions involving video game tokens, leveraging off the reputation of the Complainant's trademark. Despite the earlier decision in WIPO Case No. D2025-23342 (supra), the Respondent has continued to use the Complainant's FIFA trademark through the Disputed Domain Name for a virtually identical business.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary Matters

The Panel notes that no communication has been received from the Respondent. However, given the Complaint and Written Notice were sent to the relevant addresses disclosed by the Registrar, then the Panel considers that this satisfies the requirement in paragraph 2(a) of the UDRP Rules to "employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice". Accordingly, the Panel considers it is able to proceed to determine this Complaint and to draw inferences from the Respondent's failure to file any Response. While the Respondent's failure to file a Response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, the Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's default (see, e.g., *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp*, WIPO Case No. D2012-1909).

Substantive Matters

To succeed, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

(i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical with 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;

(iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established rights in the FIFA trademark through numerous trademark registrations worldwide, dating back to 1994.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's FIFA trademark. The addition of the terms "buy" and "coins" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.8 ("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.").

The three-member panel in *Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. MATE SERVICE CO., LIMITED,* (supra), recently concluded that the domain name <fifacoin.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FIFA trademarks. The Disputed Domain Name is nearly identical, differing only by the additional term "buy" and use of the plural form "coins".

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FIFA trademark and that the Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds the FIFA trademark is, on the evidence before the Panel, a term in which the Complainant has developed a significant reputation.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

(i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

None of these apply in the present circumstances. The Complainant has not authorised, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or to use the FIFA trademark. The Complainant has prior rights in the FIFA trademark which precede the Respondent's acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has therefore established a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and thereby the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to produce evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name (see, for example, *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web,* WIPO Case No. D2000-0624; *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd*., WIPO Case No. D2003-0455).

The terms "buy" and "coins" are descriptive and could be taken to refer to the ability to purchase either physical FIFA coins (such as licensed sports memorabilia or collectibles) or a virtual asset or cryptocurrency offered or officially endorsed by the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to produce any evidence to establish his rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly the Panel finds the Respondent has no rights or any legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy a non-exhaustive list of factors evidencing registration and use in bad faith comprises:

(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

In the present circumstances the Panel agrees with the Complainant that factor (iv) applies as the Respondent was seeking to achieve commercial gain by suggesting it was endorsed by or approved by the Complainant. The Respondent's Website features a business that provides automated sales of virtual in-game tokens/currency used in football-related video games, earning profit through transaction fees and affiliate commissions. The Respondent claims on the website to be operated by "MATE SERVICE CO. LIMITED" with an address in the United Kingdom, though the disclosed registrant is Kaijian Tao. MATE SERVICE CO., LIMITED was the Respondent in *Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. MATE SERVICE CO., LIMITED,* (supra). The present Panel considers the three person panel's reasoning in the earlier case is directly applicable to the present case, and the Respondent's conduct amounts to registration and use in bad faith. The Panel also notes that the Respondent has not filed a Response and hence has not availed himself of the opportunity to present any case of good faith that he might have. The Panel infers that none exists.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

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 <buyfifacoins.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nick J. Gardner/
Nick J. Gardner
Sole Panelist
Date: February 20, 2026