

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ARENA EVENTS GROUP LIMITED v. Naveed Anwar

Case No. D2025-5388

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ARENA EVENTS GROUP LIMITED, United Kingdom, internally represented .

The Respondent is Naveed Anwar, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maetra-me.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 23, 2025. On December 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 26, 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 26, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that 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 proceedings commenced on January 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on January 30, 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 provides temporary environments for clients in Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, including exhibition stands, experiential settings, temporary buildings, and other temporary structures. In so doing the Complainant uses the trademark MAESTRA commercially across all branded materials and client documentation, including the Complainant's proposals, quotations, website, invoices, statements of account, building signage, vehicle branding, and all other company branded property.

The Complainant owns registered trademark rights in the mark MAESTRA, including for instance the United Arab Emirates registration No. 445597, registered on June 26, 2025.

The Complainant owns domain name <maestra-me.com> for its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 21, 2025 and does not resolve to any active website. The disputed domain name was used for fraudulent emails pretending to be sent by the Complainant's employee on behalf of the Complainant and requesting a downpayment from the Complainant's client.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name mimics the Complainant's trademark by replicating the structure, appearance, and character sequence of the Complainant's legitimate domain name, with only a minor typographical alteration (i.e., the missing letter "s"). This deliberate misspelling creates a confusingly similar domain name that is visually and phonetically close to the Complainant's mark, making it highly likely that users will mistake the fraudulent domain name for the Complainant's official online identity. The similarity is intended to mislead recipients, impersonate the Complainant and facilitate fraudulent activity by exploiting trust in the Complainant's established brand. The disputed domain name differs only by omission of the letter "s", constituting classic typosquatting.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant's rights in its trademark significantly predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no authorization, affiliation, or legitimate use. Phishing and impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way and has no connection, relationship, or association with the Complainant.

The domain name contains no legitimate content and has been used exclusively for phishing and fraudulent activity, with no lawful or bona fide business purpose. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no trademark or business name corresponding to "Maetra" or "Maestra".

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name employs a deceptive typographical variation by omitting the letter "s" in the Complainant's legitimate domain name thereby collapsing the syllable structure while retaining the visual dominance of the surrounding letters that is easily overlooked by users. This form of typosquatting relies on a subtle character substitution designed to mislead recipients into believing they are interacting with the Complainant's official website. The structure, hyphen placement, and overall appearance of the disputed domain name are intentionally crafted to mimic the Complainant's domain name and to deceive users into trusting the spoofed address. At least one client of the Complainant has been defrauded into making a sizable transaction to a wrongful and fraudulent bank account. The disputed domain name was used to contact a client of the Complainant impersonating an employee of the Complainant and directing a financial

transaction to a fraudulent bank account via the creation of fraudulent payment instruction. This resulted in the Complainant's client submitting a payment to the Respondent's bank account when the client believed they were paying to a genuine account of the Complainant.

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 applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the Panel disregards gTLD ".com" for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. The Panel considers the disputed domain name consisting of intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark MAESTRA to be confusedly similar to the said trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9

Although the addition of other terms here, a hyphen and "me" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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 3.0](#), 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 available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise agree to use of its prior registered trademarks by the Respondent. The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the misspelling of the mark together with the term "me", and the choice of this term – which makes the disputed domain name nearly identical to the Complainant's official domain name – on balance, supports an inference that the Respondent intended to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name nearly identical to the Complainant's official domain name, intentionally misspelling the Complainant's trademark, and used it for sending fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant's employee. The Panel finds this confirms the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name, which is bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 name <maetra-me.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: February 4, 2026