

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Skyscanner Limited v. John Parker

Case No. D2026-0338

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Skyscanner Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Lewis Silkin LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is John Parker, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <goskyscan.com> is registered with DreamHost, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 27, 2026. On January 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 28, 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 (Proxy Protection LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 28, 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 February 2, 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 February 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 23, 2026. The Respondent sent informal email communications to the Center on January 29, 2026, and February 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 13, 24, and 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Alexandre Nappey as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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 is Skyscanner Limited, a British search aggregator and a travel agency.

The Complainant's website "www.skyscanner.net" attracts tens of millions of unique visits per month and its Skyscanner smart device app has been downloaded over 70 million times.

The Complainant's services are available in over 30 languages and in 70 currencies. In the month of March 2025 alone, the Complainant's core website, "www.skyscanner.net", was visited 41.6 million times.

The Complainant is the owner of several SKYSCANNER trademarks, including:

- International trademark Registration No. 1030086 registered on December 1, 2009 in classes 35, 39, and 42, duly renewed.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 24, 2025, and resolves an active website offering travel arrangement services including redirecting Internet users to a competitor flight comparison site.

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 its trademark SKYSCANNER, save that it omits the final three letters of the trademark ("ner") and adds the word "go" at the beginning ("SkyScanner" to "GoSkyScan"). The Complainant's registered trademark is immediately identifiable within the disputed domain name and the omitted letters and addition of "go" would be overlooked.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not own any registered rights in any trademarks which comprise part or all of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not given its consent for the Respondent to use a confusingly similar variation of its registered trademark in a domain name registration. The Complainant contends that the website at the dispute domain name reproduces the Complainant's well-known branding style including the light and dark blue coloring without the Complainant's authorization. The disputed domain name poses as either the Complainant's business or a site authorized by the Complainant to advertise and/or sell travel related services to Internet users, for commercial gain.

Third, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It was registered over 20 years after the Complainant acquired rights in the SKYSCANNER trademarks. The Respondent was aware of the reputation of the Complainant's business under the SKYSCANNER trademark at the time the disputed domain name was registered, because it has reproduced the Complainant's well-known branding style on its website for services either identical or directly related to those of the Complainant's business. The Complainant asserts that such registration and use of the disputed domain name is in an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to mislead Internet users as to an affiliation with the Complainant's rights, for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

However, the Respondent sent multiple informal emails, such as:

- On January 29, 2026: "Kindly note that I have purchased this domain ethically and my hard earned money was invested purchasing this domain and I paid 20000 GBP to build this website as well. Now no-one can come from anywhere and claim on it. If you want, you can purchase it from me professionally and ethically by paying a sum of 21000 GBP. Thanks -John"
- On February 2, 2026: "Listen clearly and loud. Stop this [...]. I didn't take any loan from you or your company to buy that domain and start my website. If you have any issues, pay me \$21000 and purchase it from me."
- On February 2, 2026: "Stop sending your [...]. I'm neither using anyone's name not pretending to be someone. I purchased a domain name with complete honesty and i want you to pay \$21000 if you wish me to shut down that domain. Keep it simple ans straight. And stop sending any further [...]."
- On February 3, 2026: "Pay \$21000 and I'm happy to shutdown my business. Who will bare my investment?"
- On February 4, 2026: "Stop it, Stop sending me these emails and harassing me. I invested more than \$20000 (USD) in this business, why didn't this stupid company (Skyscanners or whatever its names is) purchase this domain in advance if they had too much trouble. I didn't use their name or not pretending to be them. I am doing my separate business and want \$21000 to shut it down. So now you guys listen to this very very very carefully. You sent me one more message and it will be counted as mental harassment of me. So either pay \$21000 and I will shut down this business or stop sending any further emails. Good Bye -John"

The Respondent sent further emails demanding that all communications with the Respondent cease.

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. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The disputed domain name incorporates the SKYSCANNER trademark with the omission of the final three letters "ner" and the addition of the term "go". The Panel finds that such alterations do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.8 and 1.9. See also *Skyscanner Limited v. Cyber Domain Services Private Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3198](#).

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The various emails sent by the Respondent do not show any right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

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.

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel notes that the SKYSCANNER trademarks predate for years the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel also considers the goodwill in the SKYSCANNER trademark, as well as the composition and use of the disputed domain name.

In addition, the Respondent did not provide any argument or explanation as to how it came up with the confusingly similar disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel finds it very likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's prior trademarks in mind.

The Panel also considers that the mere registration of the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the well-known SKYSCANNER trademark by the Respondent, who has no affiliation with the Complainant, creates a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Considering the use of the disputed domain name described above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the well-known SKYSCANNER trademark.

The various emails sent by the Respondent all along the proceedings, notably offering for sale the disputed domain name for an excessive amount of USD 21,000, a consideration most likely in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name (absent any evidence to the contrary from the Respondent), is further evidence of bad faith.

In conclusion, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and 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 <goskyscan.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alexandre Nappey/

Alexandre Nappey

Sole Panelist

Date: March 11, 2026