ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Muitas Ltd. v. sk media
Case No. D2026-0544

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Muitas Ltd., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Silverstein Legal, United States.

The Respondent is sk media, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <en-clips4sale.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 February 9, 2026. On February 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 11, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 12, 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 12, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on March 18, 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 in the business of providing an online platform that allows users to post and sell audiovisual content through clip stores on the World Wide Web. It owns the trademarks CLIPS4SALE and CLIPS4SALE.COM, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration (e.g., respectively, United States Reg. No. 3554200, registered on December 30, 2008, and United States Reg. No. 3508680, registered on September 30, 2008).

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was registered on September 20, 2025. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to set up a website impersonating the Complainant and offering services identical to those offered by the Complainant. The Respondent's website prominently displays the Complainant's CLIPS4SALE mark in its header and otherwise resembles the Complainant's website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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 disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. 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. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the CLIPS4SALE mark by providing evidence of its trademark registration for that mark. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the CLIPS4SALE mark in its entirety with the addition of the term "en-", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's CLIPS4SALE mark. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8. The CLIPS4SALE mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent to use the Complainant's marks, (2) the Respondent is not commonly known by the Complainant's marks and holds no corresponding trademark rights, (3) the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, and (4) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to egregiously and fraudulently present itself as the official website of the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this showing. The use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and pass itself off as the Complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Policy describes several non-exhaustive circumstances demonstrating a respondent's bad faith use and registration. Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, a panel may find bad faith when a respondent "[uses] the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [respondent's] website or location or a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location".

The Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Registering and using the disputed domain name to imitate the Complainant and otherwise hold itself out as operating as the Complainant is a clear example of bad faith registration and use under the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 <en-clips4sale.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/
Evan D. Brown
Sole Panelist
Date: March 30, 2026