

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Udemy, Inc. v. eric feldman
Case No. D2026-0205

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Udemy, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is eric feldman, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <udemy.free> 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 19, 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 disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (e7b20ba176144aa98512636b08ae54c6-Namech, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 21, 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 amended Complaint on January 22, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent’s default on February 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on March 26, 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, based in California, United States, provides online courses to users in 180 countries. It is the proprietor of several trademarks, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 4314406 for UDEMY (word mark), registered on April 2, 2013, for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42; and
- European Union Trade Mark No. 011006319 for UDEMY (word mark), registered on November 28, 2012, for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, and 42.

The Complainant operates its primary business website at the domain name <udemy.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 18, 2025. At the time of the Complaint and of this Decision, it did not resolve to an active website. The record contains evidence that mail exchange (“MX”) servers have been configured for it.

The record indicates that the Complainant sent notice letters to the Respondent on November 28, and December 4, 2025. The record does not reflect any responses thereto.

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 it is a leading online course provider, founded in 2010, offering paid and free courses in 77 languages to over 81 million users. The Complainant’s website has over 80 million visits per month. The Complainant has extensively promoted its UDEMY mark through social media and the company has gained significant recognition in the media. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s mark. The Respondent has no rights in this mark, nor any license to use the Complainant’s mark. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and is not being used in connection with a bona fide business or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The distinctive nature of the UDEMY mark, which is a portmanteau of “You” and “Academy”, makes any fair use improbable. The Respondent’s choice of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.free” relates directly to the Complainant’s offering of free online courses. The registration of the Complainant’s mark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by 13 years. The disputed domain name is being passively held in bad faith. The Respondent’s activation of MX records for the disputed domain name creates a risk of confusion to unsuspecting recipients of such email.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under 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”.

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.

The entirety of the UDEMY mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant’s UDEMY mark. The Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name therefore carries a high risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Respondent has not put forward any rights or legitimate interests. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that there are any circumstances or activities that would establish the Respondent's rights therein. Rather, the evidence indicates that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. Such use cannot establish rights or legitimate interests under the circumstances of this case. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.2.

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 disputed domain name were registered 13 years after the Complainant registered its UDEMY mark. The composition of the disputed domain name reflects the Complainant's mark in its entirety, implying an affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant provides evidence that its mark has gained a significant reputation through extensive use. On this record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank page) 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 distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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.

Additionally, the record reflects that the Respondent has configured MX records for the disputed domain name. In light of the finding that the Respondent has no rights in the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that preparatory actions for sending emails from the inherently misleading disputed domain name indicate a risk that the Respondent may use the disputed domain names in bad faith.

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 <udemy.free> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: March 27, 2026