

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mozilla Foundation, Mozilla Corporation v. teaforwomens teaforwomens, Test
Case No. D2025-5376

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Mozilla Foundation and Mozilla Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondent is teaforwomens teaforwomens, Test, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <m0zilla.org> 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 22, 2025. On December 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 23, 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 Complainants on December 24, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on January 5, 2026.

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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. The Respondent sent an email to the Center on December 24, 2025. A third party sent emails to the Center on December 24, 2025, December 25, 2025, and January 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on February 18, 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 Mozilla Foundation is a non-profit organization based in California, United States. The Complainant Mozilla Corporation is Mozilla Foundation's wholly owned subsidiary. Mozilla Foundation and Mozilla Corporation are hereafter referred to collectively as "the Complainant."

The Complainant supports and develops open-source software programs. Its main website is available at "www.mozilla.org" and is best known for creating the world-renowned Firefox Internet browser which was released on November 9, 2004.

The Complainant has registered, inter alia, the following trademarks:

- MOZILLA, (word), European Union Trade Mark No. 000182899, registered on March 3, 1999, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 38, and 42; and
- MOZILLA (word), United States Registration No. 2815227, registered on February 17, 2004, for goods and services in International Class 9; and
- MOZILLA (word), International Trademark Registration No. 974622, registered on August 13, 2008, for goods and services in International Class 9.

The Complainant is the registrant of many domain names consisting of the mark MOZILLA, under a wide range of generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs"), including <mozilla.com>, <mozilla.org>, and <mozilla.net> (since 1994), as well as numerous country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs").

The disputed domain name was registered on November 13, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, it resolved to a Registrar parking site. At the time of drafting this Decision, it resolves to a parking site which contains the wording "MOZILLA.ORG Launching Soon".

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MOZILLA, in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, the Respondent and a third party, who gives the impression of representing the Respondent, have sent a number of e-mails to the Complainant and to the Center the latest dated January 15, 2026, stating "Hi, I would like to settle this".

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed 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 SelectUDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, substituting the letter "o" in the trademark with the similar-appearing number "0". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As indicated above the Respondent has not filed a formal Response, but in an e-mail to the Center dated January 15, 2026, the third party who gives the impression of representing the Respondent stated: "I want to settle". Although this statement may form sufficient basis for an immediate order to transfer the disputed domain name, see section 4.10 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the Panel considers it appropriate to render a

decision on the merits in the circumstances of this case. In this regard, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is used for a parking site, now with wording that gives the impression that it will soon be an official website of the Complainant. Moreover, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the significant reputation of the Complainant and its trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, based on the 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 disputed domain name <m0zilla.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026