

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Barclays Bank UK PLC v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC  
Case No. D2026-0339

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

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

The disputed domain name <barclays.zip> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 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 amendment to the Complaint on February 2, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 February 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion as the sole panelist in this matter on March 12, 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 a wholly owned subsidiary of Barclays PLC, a British multinational banking and financial services company headquartered in London with operations in retail, wholesale and investment banking, as well as wealth management, mortgage lending and credit cards. The Complainant is responsible for Barclays PLC's retail operations, providing day-to-day products and services to 24 million individual and business customers. Additionally, the Complainant is responsible for Barclays PLC's investment banking, corporate, private and overseas services operations (amongst others), providing products and services for large corporate, wholesale and international banking clients. The Complainant has operations in over 50 countries and territories and has approximately 48 million customers. Therefore, the Complainant has a substantial worldwide reputation for banking and financial services including corporate and investment services (both overseas and in the UK).

The Complainant claims to be the licensee of the owner of numerous registered trademarks containing or incorporating BARCLAYS, including the following:

- BARCLAY and BARCLAYS, UK mark registered under No. UK00001286579, registered on March 3, 1989, and covering services in class 36;
- BARCLAYS, European Union word mark No. 000055236, registered on January 26, 1999, and covering products and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36 and 42; and
- BARCLAYS, United States of America ("United States") word mark No. 3195676, registered on January 9, 2007, and covering services in class 36.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 10, 2025. According to the Complainant's evidence, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website including the Complainant's BARCLAYS mark and purporting to offer banking and financial services. The website currently resolves to a "Dangerous Website" warning page.

#### **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 identical or at least confusingly similar to a trademark in which it claims to have rights.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name as, in summary:

- to the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent does not hold any trademarks or other intellectual property rights in any of the Complainant's trademarks;
- the website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves/resolved is a page that purportedly offers banking and financial services and includes a link to a "Sign in" page, suggesting that the website is attempting to fraudulently obtain the banking information of visitors to the website;

- even if the content of the website were not related to banking and financial services, the Disputed Domain Name would, at the very least, cause initial interest confusion because a user of the website will, based on the Disputed Domain Name alone, be visiting the website in the expectation that it is an official website of the Complainant and likely be a potential customer looking for banking or financial services. Given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademarks in full, and without any other distinctive element, the Disputed Domain Name is such that it could never be used for a legitimate purpose by any party other than the Complainant;
- the website linked to the Disputed Domain Name showed a United States flag in the top right corner, suggesting that when the site was live, it was attempting to target website visitors based in the United States. The Complainant has a particularly strong presence in North America with approximately 20 million customers in the United States alone. The Complainant has registered various trademarks in the United States.

Finally, the Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In summary, according to the Complainant:

- the Respondent acquired the Disputed Domain Name for the purpose of unfairly disrupting the business of the Complainant by deceiving customers into believing either that the Disputed Domain Name is one of the Complainant's official websites or that the Disputed Domain Name is authorised by, or otherwise connected with, the Complainant;
- given the considerable reputation of the Complainant in the provision of financial and banking services, it is inconceivable that the Disputed Domain Name could have been registered by the Respondent in ignorance of the Complainant, and without the intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademarks;
- the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name would, at the very least, cause initial interest confusion because of its similarity to the Complainant's trademarks.

The Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name has also prevented the Complainant from registering a domain name which corresponds to the Complainant's trademarks contrary to paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **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.

Panels have been prepared to infer the existence of authorization to file a UDRP case based on the facts and circumstances described in the complaint (which may be supported by information that is publicly available online such as company websites or financial statements). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.4.

In the present case, the Complainant claims to be a licensee of the owner of the invoked trademarks. While the Complainant does not provide specific evidence of authorization to file the Complaint, it states it is a wholly owned subsidiary of the trademark owner, which is confirmed by a simple online search.

Therefore, the Panel finds 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 observes that the entirety of the BARCLAYS mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name, without any addition.

It is well established that generic Top-Level-Domains (“gTLDs”), here “.zip”, may be disregarded when considering whether the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

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 that the Respondent has not apparently been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is “Host Master” from the organization “Njalla Okta LLC”.

Fundamentally, a respondent’s use of a domain name will not be considered “fair” if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. The correlation between a domain name and the complainant’s mark is often central to this inquiry. Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Panel finds that this applies to the present case.

Beyond looking at the disputed domain name and the nature of any additional terms appended to the mark, UDRP panels also assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case, such as the content of the website linked to a disputed domain name and the absence of a response, support a fair use or not. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

According to the Complainant’s evidence, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website including i.a. the Complainant’s BARCLAYS mark, a big title: “The Future of Digital Banking”, and a link to a “Sign in” page. In the Panel’s view, this neither amounts to a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s mark in the context of banking services increases the risk of confusion for Internet users. UDRP panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g.

impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

According to the Panel, the website currently resolving to a “Dangerous Website” warning page does not change the above assessment.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

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. Among these factors demonstrating bad faith registration and use is the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when it registered the Disputed Domain Name:

- the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, without any change or addition;
- some of the Complainant’s trademarks predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by more than 20 or even 30 years;
- the Disputed Domain Name referred to a website reproducing the Complainant’s mark in connection with a purported offer of services identical or at least similar to the Complainant’s products.

In the Panel’s view, the circumstances of this case indicate that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. Given that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

By failing to respond to the Complaint, the Respondent did not take any initiative to contest the foregoing. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Rules, the Panel may draw the conclusions it considers appropriate.

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 <barclays.zip> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/*  
**Flip Jan Claude Petillion**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: March 26, 2026