

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Barclays Bank UK PLC v. Bitso Wallet
Case No. D2026-0269

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Barclays Bank UK PLC, United Kingdom, represented by Bird & Bird LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Bitso Wallet, Mexico.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <barclaysbank.net> is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (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 (Whois Registrant Details: REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 27, 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 amended Complaint on February 2, 2026

On January 27, 2026 the Center informed the parties in Spanish and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Spanish. On February 2, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 February 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Enrique Bardales Mendoza as the sole panelist in this matter on March 4, 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, Barclays Bank UK PLC, is an international banking institution headquartered in the United Kingdom with a global presence in the financial services sector. The Complainant forms part of the Barclays Group, one of the world's leading banking groups, which provides retail banking, corporate banking, investment, and wealth management services.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations incorporating the term BARCLAYS, used in connection with financial and banking services. These include, for example:

- BARCLAYS trademark, United Kingdom, registration number UK00002461096, registered on January 11, 2008 for financial services in Class 36.
- BARCLAYS trademark, European Union, registration number 002315554, registered on February 13, 2003 for services in Class 36.
- BARCLAYS BANK trademark, United Kingdom, registration number UK00900055236, registered on January 26, 1996, for Class 36, specifically for financial services.

The Complainant also operates several domain names incorporating its trademark, including, among others, <barclays.co>, <privatebank.barclays>, and <barclayscorporate>, through which it provides information about its financial services and access to its online banking platform.

The disputed domain name <barclaysbank.net> was registered on August 7, 2025. According to the evidence submitted in the Complaint, the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website, although intermittent activity in relation to such domain name has been reported.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

In particular, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademarks incorporating the denomination "Barclays", since it reproduces such denomination together with the additional term "bank". According to the Complainant, the addition of such term does not distinguish the disputed domain name from its trademarks and, on the contrary, reinforces the association with the Complainant, given its reputation as a banking entity and its global provision of financial services.

Furthermore, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It is asserted that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant, nor any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the mark in the disputed domain name in any form. In addition, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and does not hold any registered trademark corresponding to it. Accordingly, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent cannot claim any right to use the disputed domain name as it does not offer any products or services of its own.

On the other hand, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, since it was registered long after the Complainant had obtained rights in the registered trademarks that contain the denomination "BARCLAYS". Furthermore, considering that the Complainant's mark enjoys a significant reputation in the financial services sector, the registration of a domain name incorporating such denomination may cause confusion among Internet users. In addition, the Complainant maintains that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves does not appear to be accessible; nevertheless, the domain name itself could generate initial confusion among users seeking banking or financial services.

On the basis of all the foregoing, the Complainant requests that the transfer of the disputed domain name be ordered.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Spanish. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and the amended Complaint were filed in English. However, the Registrar disclosed that the language of the Registration Agreement is Spanish. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that: (i) the disputed domain name includes the term "bank" which is an English term; (ii) when the website was live, the content was written entirely in English; and (iii) even if the Registration Agreement is in Spanish, pursuant to Clause 9.4 of the Registration Agreement if there is any inconsistency between that version and the English version, the Respondent is bound by the English version.

The Respondent was notified in English and Spanish of this proceeding but did not file a Response or comment on the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive issues

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the following three elements are present in order to obtain the transfer or cancellation of the disputed domain name.

- a. It must be demonstrated that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.
- b. It must be demonstrated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.
- c. It must be demonstrated that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Since, in the present case, no response or submission was made by the Respondent to the Complaint filed by the Complainant, the Panel is in a position to accept as true those allegations of the Complainant that it considers reasonable (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards, LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#)).

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 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 Panel considers that the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Consequently, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

In this case, the disputed domain name reproduces the denomination "BARCLAYS", which forms part of the Complainant's registered trademarks. In this regard, the disputed domain name <barclaysbank.net> incorporates such denomination together with the additional term "bank", which does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms (in this case, "bank") may be relevant in the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel considers that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, it is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain "gTLD" (in this case, ".net") is generally disregarded when assessing whether a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the complainant has rights (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1).

On the basis of the foregoing, the Panel considers that 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.

In particular, the Complainant has stated that, to the best of its knowledge, the Respondent does not hold any registered trademarks or other intellectual property rights in the denomination “BARCLAYS”. Likewise, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves does not appear to be accessible.

In such circumstances, the Panel considers that the Respondent has not demonstrated any of the circumstances that could confer rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

On the basis of the foregoing, the Panel finds that 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 incorporates the denomination “BARCLAYS”, corresponding to the Complainant’s trademarks, together with the additional term “bank”, which bears a direct relationship to the Complainant’s banking activities. Likewise, the disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant had obtained rights in its trademarks.

Panels have found that the lack of use of a domain name (including a blank or “under construction” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having examined the available record, the Panel notes the distinctive character and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, as well as the misleading composition of the disputed domain name, and concludes 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.

The Panel concludes 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 <barclaysbank.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Enrique Bardales Mendoza/

Enrique Bardales Mendoza

Sole Panelist

Date: March 18, 2026