

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gulf Agency Company Limited v. Dollyne Peris, Dollypups
Case No. D2026-0260

1. The Parties

Complainant is Gulf Agency Company Limited, United Arab Emirates, represented by Isler & Pedrazzini AG, Switzerland.

Respondent is Dollyne Peris, Dollypups, South Africa.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gaccworldwide.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 22, 2026. On January 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 23, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on January 26, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on January 28, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 19, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 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

Complainant is a company organized under the laws of the United Arab Emirates that is active in the shipping and logistics industry.

Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of various trademarks relating to its company name acronym and brand GAC, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Word/design trademark GAC, International Registration (World Intellectual Property Organization), registration number: 981501, registration date: May 13, 2008, status: active.

Moreover, Complainant has demonstrated to own the domain name <gac.com> which resolves to Complainant's official website at "www.gac.com", promoting Complainant's services in the shipping and logistics industry internationally.

Respondent, according to the Registrar verification, is located in South Africa. The disputed domain name was registered on April 22, 2025. By the time of the rendering of this Decision, the disputed domain name does resolve to an error page. Complainant, however, has demonstrated that, at some point before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.gaccworldwide.com", which imitated Complainant's official website at "www.gac.com" by providing the same content in a poor web design quality, thereby prominently displaying Complainant's GAC trademark and official logo, and showing contact details which were linked to some sort of fraudulent activity.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be cancelled.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's GAC trademark, as it incorporates the textual component of the latter at the beginning, and only adds the letter "c" (which results in a typo-squatting) as well as the term "worldwide". Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (1) Complainant has not licensed its GAC trademark to Respondent, nor has it otherwise authorized the latter to use such trademark, (2) Complainant's GAC trademark is a coined word without a descriptive or generic meaning, and (3) the website operated under the disputed domain name imitates Complainant's official website and in particular uses Complainant's GAC trademark including its official logo. Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since (1) the disputed domain name constitutes a typical case of typo-squatting, (2) the website operated under the disputed domain name imitates Complainant's official website in an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain, and (3) Complainant has a strong suspicion that Respondent is trying to collect credit card information for misuse or to otherwise profit from the confusion created.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that 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.

Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

First, 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 Complainant's GAC trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its GAC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Also, the entirety of such trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, merely added by the letter "c" (which constitutes a typo-squatting of Complainant's GAC trademark) and the term "worldwide". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's GAC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The fact that the disputed domain name obviously includes an intentional misspelling of Complainant's GAC trademark is not at all inconsistent with such finding of confusing similarity. Typo-squatted domain names are, on the contrary, intended to be confusing so that Internet users, who unwittingly make common typing errors, will enter the typo-squatted domain name instead of the correct spelled trademark. Accordingly, UDRP panels agree that domain names which consist, e.g., of an intentional misspelling of a trademark are considered to be confusingly similar under the UDRP. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. Moreover, although the addition of other terms (here, the term "worldwide") may bear on assessment of the second and third element, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's GAC trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel, therefore, finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Second, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

In particular, Respondent has not been authorized to use Complainant's GAC trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondent's name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name and Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the acronym "gac" which obviously refers to Complainant's company name "Gulf Agency Company". Rather, at some point before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.gaccworldwide.com", which imitated Complainant's official website at "www.gac.com" by providing the same content in a poor web design quality, thereby prominently displaying Complainant's GAC trademark and official logo, and showing contact details which are linked to some sort of fraudulent activity. Such making use of the disputed domain name, therefore, neither qualifies as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair within the meaning of the Policy. Finally, panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, Complainant's impersonation) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Third, 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 circumstances of this case leave no doubt that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant's rights in its GAC trademark when registering the disputed domain name and that the latter is clearly directed thereto. Moreover, using the disputed domain name, which is at least confusingly similar to Complainant's GAC trademark, to run a website at "www.gaccworldwide.com", which imitates Complainant's official website at "www.gac.com" by providing the same content just in a poor web design quality, thereby prominently displaying Complainant's GAC trademark and official logo, and showing contact details which are linked to some sort of fraudulent activity, is a clear indication that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's GAC trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondent's website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Finally, panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, Complainant's impersonation) constitutes bad faith, too. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel, therefore, finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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, <gaccworldwide.com>, be cancelled.

/Stephanie G. Hartung/

Stephanie G. Hartung

Sole Panelist

Date: March 4, 2026