ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
419Studios Ltd v. Fayyaz Ahamd, Privacy Department, and IceNetworks Ltd.
Case No. D2026-0064

1. The Parties

The Complainant is 419Studios Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by Harbottle & Lewis LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Fayyaz Ahamd, Pakistan, and Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd., Iceland.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <corteizuksite.com> and <thecorteizxyz.com> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited. The disputed domain name <thecorteizuk.com> is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 8, 2026. On January 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names and another domain name. On January 14 and 19, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names and another domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Fayyaz Ahamd / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 19, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. On January 21, 2026, the Complainant requested an extension until February 7, 2026. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 6, 2026, withdrawing one domain name from the proceedings.

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2026. The Respondent Privacy Department, Ice Networks Ltd. sent email communications to the Center on January 22, February 13, and March 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on March 10, 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 a UK-based streetwear clothing business which was incorporated in 2019.

The Complainant is the owner of several CORTEIZ trade marks including the following:

- United Kingdom trade mark CORTEIZ registered on March 1, 2024 under number UK00003976277;
- European Union Trade Mark CORTEIZ registered on May 3, 2024, under number 018963656.

The disputed domain names were registered on June 8, 2024.

The three disputed domain names used to point to websites falsely suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant, reproducing the logo of the Complainant, and purporting to offer products of the Complainant, without any disclaimer as to the nature of the relationship with the Complainant (or absence thereof). At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name <corteizuksite.com> did not point to any website and generated an error message whereas the two other disputed domain names pointed to highly similar websites purporting to offer products of the Complainant at discounted prices.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that all three disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's CORTEIZ trade mark as they all contain the entire trade mark of the Complainant.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondents' lack a right or a legitimate interest in the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that the Respondents do not own any relevant trade mark rights and that they are not licensed by the Complainant to use the CORTEIZ trade mark in domain names or otherwise. The Complainant points to the use of each disputed domain name to point to a website impersonating the Complainant as a type of use that cannot be considered in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Turning to the issue of bad faith, the Complainant considers that in light of the Complainant's prior rights in the trade mark CORTEIZ and the online and media visibility of its trade mark, the Respondents registered the disputed domain names in an effort to specifically target the Complainant. The Complainant also asserts that the disputed domain names are used in bad faith given that they all pointed to websites impersonating the Complainant and inviting unsuspecting Internet users to submit their personal data (as they would on the Complainant's official website).

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply formally to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent Privacy Department, Ice Networks Ltd. sent email communications to the Center on January 22, February 13, and March 4, 2026, merely addressing one of the annexes to the Complaint and explaining that the websites associated with the disputed domain names <corteizuksite.com> and <thecorteizxyz.com> are not identical to each other.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue – Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different disputed domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not directly comment on the Complainant's request but the Respondent Privacy Department, Ice Networks Ltd. merely addressed one of the annexes to the Complaint and explained that the websites associated with the disputed domain names are not identical to each other.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that all three disputed domain names were registered on the exact same day and used to point to highly similar websites.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 names. 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 CORTEIZ trade mark is fully reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the CORTEIZ trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here “the” or “uksite”, or “xyz” or “uk”, 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 names and the CORTEIZ trade 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.

The three disputed domain names used to point to websites falsely suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant, reproducing the logo of the Complainant, and purporting to offer products of the Complainant, without any disclaimer as to the nature of the relationship with the Complainant (or absence thereof).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation or passing off, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that each disputed domain name reproduces the exact CORTEIZ trade mark of the Complainant which has benefited from meaningful media coverage and online visibility. The Panel finds that, in light of the circumstances of the present case, this cannot be a coincidence and that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trade mark when it registered the disputed domain names. The Panel also notes that whilst communications were sent to the Center, there was no rebuttal relating to the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain names.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

In relation to the disputed domain name <corteizuksite.com> which does not currently point to any active content, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad

faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trade mark and the fact that the disputed domain name <corteizuksite.com> used to point to content falsely suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name <corteizuksite.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

As for the two other disputed domain names, <thecorteizxyz.com> and <thecorteizuk.com>, they point to websites that falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant and that contain a login page inviting unsuspecting Internet users to submit personal data.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation or passing off, 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 <corteizuksite.com>, <thecorteizuk.com>, and <thecorteizxyz.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/
Vincent Denoyelle
Sole Panelist
Date: March 24, 2026