

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Maks Ovnik v. Abdulrauf Dansuleiman, LinuxCodes Technologies  
Case No. D2026-0197

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Maks Ovnik, United Kingdom, represented by Maks Ovnik, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Abdulrauf Dansuleiman, LinuxCodes Technologies, Nigeria.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

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

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 17, 2026. On January 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on February 20, 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 operates an online chatting platform and real-time video communication service under the trademark UMINGLE.

The Complainant is the owner of the United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00004280309 for UMINGLE (word mark), filed on October 19, 2025, and registered on January 9, 2026, in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42 and 45.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <umingle.com>, registered on April 4, 2003, and used by the Complainant in connection with its chatting platform, which was launched on October 14, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 22, 2025, and currently resolves to an inactive website. However, prior to the present proceeding, the disputed domain name pointed to a website promoting chatting services identical to those offered by the Complainant.

#### **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 trademark UMINGLE in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the letter "s" at the end of the mark and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com".

The Complainant states that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since: i) the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its UMINGLE trademark in any way; ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and iii) the disputed domain name has not been used for a bona fide offering of goods or services as it has been redirected to an online platform providing identical services to those offered by the Complainant, where the disputed domain name was also offered for sale through a timed pop-up message.

The Complainant states that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith because: i) prior to any notice of the Complainant's rights, the Respondent prominently displayed a "For Sale" popup on its website offering the disputed domain name for sale, which was later removed, following receipt of the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter; ii) in its correspondence with the Complainant prior to this proceeding, the Respondent explicitly offered to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for an amount of USD 5,000, which is far in excess of out-of-pocket registration costs; iii) the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and registered the disputed domain name opportunistically to capitalize on the traffic and nascent goodwill generated by the Complainant's public launch, as it registered the disputed domain name only 3 days after the Complainant formally secured trademark protection and 8 days after the Complainant's public launch of its UMINGLE platform; iv) the Respondent initially used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain, through the publication of a service called "Umingles Connect" offering identical "Chat with Stranger" services to those offered by the Complainant, despite claiming, in its reply to the Complainant's cease and desist letter, that the disputed domain name corresponded to a "standalone, coined term" and denying any knowledge of the Complainant or its brand at the time of registration; and v) the HTML source code of the Respondent's website contained Google AdSense scripts for monetization.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: “A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.” Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that 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 Select UDRP 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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of a valid trademark registration for the word mark UMINGLE

The Complainant’s mark is entirely reproduced in the disputed domain name with the mere addition of a single letter “s”. In cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

As to the gTLD “.com”, it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Therefore, 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.

According to the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark or the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, there is no evidence showing that the Respondent made use of, or preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use without intention to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the UMINGLE trademark.

Indeed, even though the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website, based on the evidence provided by the Complainant – which has not been contested by the Respondent - the disputed domain name initially resolved to a website promoting chatting services identical to those offered by the Complainant on its website "www.umingle.com", which were provided under the name "Umingles Connect". Such use of the disputed domain name suggests that the Respondent was indeed aware of the Complainant and its platform and intended to attract users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion and association with the Complainant.

Moreover, the Complainant's trademark appears to be a coined mark, and the Respondent has not provided any explanation for its registration of the disputed domain name, which differs from the mark by the mere addition of a single letter "s". Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is inherently misleading as it suggests an affiliation with the Complainant and that its very selection by the Respondent suggests an intent to capitalize on the Complainant's trademark.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered 3 days after the Complainant filed its trademark application for UMINGLE in the United Kingdom and 8 days after the public launch of the Complainant's platform available at "www.umingle.com", providing online chat and instant videocall services.

In view of the above and of the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its UMINGLE platform at the time of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, considering the timing of registration, the composition of the disputed domain name and its use in connection with a website providing services identical to the ones offered by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to unfairly capitalize on the Complainant's nascent trademark rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2.

The initial redirection of the disputed domain name to the website described above, providing identical services to those offered by the Complainant and containing Google AdSense for monetization, suggests that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the UMINGLE mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that, in the exchange of correspondence with the Complainant following receipt of the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter dated January 16, 2026, the Respondent requested USD 5,000 for the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that this is further evidence of bad faith.

The disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the prior use of the disputed domain name made by the Respondent and the Respondent's failure to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

## **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 <umingles.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Luca Barbero/*

**Luca Barbero**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 6, 2026