

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Maks Ovnik v. Abbigail Abril, AbrilAbbigail
Case No. D2026-0177

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Maks Ovnik, United Kingdom, self-represented.

The Respondent Abbigail Abril, AbrilAbbigail,¹ United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <uhmingle.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 16, 2026. On January 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 16, 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 (Furkan Beşirli / Yusuf Emircan Kurt / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Pixelstream Studio) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 19, 2026, 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 amendment to the Complaint on January 19, 2026.

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”).

¹ The Panel considers that the Registrar-confirmed Respondent, Abbigail Abril, AbrilAbbigail, is a proper respondent in these proceedings.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew F. Christie 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 is an individual who is responsible for the operation of a random chat and social networking platform which operates using the domain name <umingle.com>. This platform commenced on October 14, 2025.

The Complainant is the owner of United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. 00004280309 for the word trademark UMINGLE (registered on January 9, 2026).

The disputed domain name was registered on October 25, 2025. The Complainant provided an undated screenshot showing that the disputed domain name resolved to a website with the heading "Meet New People – Instantly", and stating that "Uhmingle.com connects you to real people for one-on-one video or text chats, anytime and anywhere—no sign-up required". The website further displayed an "official" notice as follows: "Some people search "umingle" or [...] but our official domain [name] is uhmingle.com ...". As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a website with the heading "Meet Strangers with your interests!" and stating "Omegle (sic) is a great way to meet new friends. You are paired randomly with another person to talk one-on-one. Add your interests to be paired with someone who shares them! To help you stay safe, chats are anonymous unless you tell someone who you are."

On January 13, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist email to various email addresses believed to be associated with the Respondent. On January 14, 2026, the Complainant received a reply (from an email address that corresponds to the one confirmed by the Registrar as the Respondent's) that proposed rebranding the Uhmingle app if the Complainant withdrew his complaint to Google Play of trademark infringement which had resulted in the Uhmingle app being removed from the Google Play platform. Subsequent communications between the parties did not lead to a resolution of the Complainant's concerns.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights, on the following grounds. It reproduces the Complainant's UMINGLE trademark in its entirety, adding only the letter "h" after the initial "u". The addition of the letter "h" creates a phonetic equivalent to the Complainant's trademark. "Uhmingle" and "Umingle" are pronounced identically or nearly identically by English speakers. This is a clear instance of typosquatting, where the disputed domain name is intended to capture traffic from users who misspell the Complainant's brand or rely on phonetic spelling. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purpose of determining confusing similarity. The Complainant's trademark rights pre-date the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, on the following grounds. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the UMINGLE trademark or to register a domain name incorporating the trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “Uhmingle”. The Respondent’s name and organization do not resemble the disputed domain name. The Respondent is using the confusingly similar disputed domain name to operate a directly competing random chat service. The Respondent’s lack of legitimate interest is further evidenced by the fact that Google Play removed the Respondent’s associated mobile application “Uhmingle” for infringement of the Complainant’s trademark on January 13, 2026.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, on the following grounds, among others. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name specifically to target the Complainant’s newly launched brand, disrupting the Complainant’s business and attempting to attract users for commercial gain through confusion. The timeline conclusively demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name 6 days after the Complainant filed its application for registration of the UMINGLE trademark, and 11 days after the public launch of the Complainant’s UMINGLE platform. Given that both Parties operate in the specific niche of “random video chat and text chat” services, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s entry into the market. The Respondent’s conduct constitutes classic typosquatting. By registering a phonetically identical domain name for a clone service immediately following the Complainant’s launch, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor. The Respondent’s website includes monetization features and serves to distribute the Respondent’s mobile application. By using the disputed domain name to intercept traffic and funnel it to this also infringing commercial app, the Respondent has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation for commercial gain.

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. In some cases, such assessment may also entail a more holistic aural or phonetic comparison of the complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name to ascertain confusing similarity. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“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. It is the owner of a trademark registration for the word trademark UMINGLE.

Once the gTLD “.com” is ignored (which is appropriate in this case), the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant’s word trademark into which the letter “h” has been inserted after the letter “u”. The addition of this letter does not negate the visual and aural similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its UMINGLE trademark. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolved to a website that purported to offer a random chat service similar to that offered by the Complainant under its trademark. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name in this way unfairly took advantage of the Complainant’s trademark for the Respondent’s benefit. Such use of the disputed domain name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, and is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Accordingly, such use does not confer on the Respondent rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has not rebutted this. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In the present case, the Panel notes that: (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name very soon after the Complainant launched its random chat service under its trademark; (ii) the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, and merely adds one letter which does not dispel the confusingly similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s trademark; and (iii) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a web location at which a competing random chat service is offered. While the disputed domain name was registered prior to the registration of the Complainant’s trademark, the Complainant has provided evidence demonstrating its use of the trademark in connection with its chat platform as early as October 14, 2025, which predates the registration of the disputed domain name. It is clear the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s use of UMINGLE.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. The evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 name <uhmingle.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew F. Christie/

Andrew F. Christie

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026