

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Raya App, Inc. v. ghi bi
Case No. D2026-0613

1. The Parties

Complainant is Raya App, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP, United States.

Respondent is ghi bi, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rayaapp.xyz> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 13, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 18, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 18, 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 February 21, 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 February 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on March 19, 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 owns and operates the Raya mobile application and related services. Raya is a private, membership-based social network application launched in 2015. Originally conceived as an exclusive dating platform for people in creative industries, the application has since evolved to include features for professional networking and social discovery. Complainant operates its main website at <rayatheapp.com> since November 6, 2014.

Complainant owns the United States trademark registration No. 4888928, RAYA (word), filed on May 28, 2015 and registered on January 19, 2016, for goods and services in International Classes 9 and 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 7, 2026 and leads to a website (the "Website") under which purportedly operates an online casino. Complainant's trademark RAYA is prominently displayed in the landing page where the phrase "Play Raya App Games" appears in a dominant manner. Other phrases in the Website include "raya app games", "casino collections", "live casino games", and a copyright notice "2025 raya app. All rights reserved", while the Website claims to be the "ultimate" or "premier" "gaming platform in the Philippines". The Website has a section devoted to the "raya app vip membership". This membership purports to allow users additional cashback options, bonus plays, and other benefits. The Website contains also a "Raya App Frequently Asked Questions" section where there are instructions and links to download the "Raya App" and deposit money. The Website links redirect users to a third-party seemingly gambling website at "www.56jl55.com". Complainant sent a cease and desist email at the email address appearing on the Website which bounced.

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.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain name:

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

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 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.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "app", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".xyz" is disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); and *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)).

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 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 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.

Prior to the notice of the dispute, Respondent did not demonstrate any use of the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the contrary, as Complainant demonstrated, the disputed domain name resolved to the Website, which featured Complainant's trademark, including Complainant's app name (which also corresponds to Complainant's company name) in the copyright notice, and a link inviting users to download "Raya App", which, coupled with the composition of the disputed domain name highly similar to that of Complainant's official domain name, is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the Website is that of Complainant or an affiliated entity or an authorized partner of Complainant, and, on balance, signals Respondent's intention to target Complainant.

Per the Complaint, Respondent is not an affiliated entity or an authorized partner of Complainant and no agreement, express or otherwise, exists allowing the use of Complainant's trademark on the Website and the use of the disputed domain name by Respondent.

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.

The Panel concludes that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. Because the RAYA mark had been used and registered long before the disputed domain name registration by Respondent, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name (*Tudor Games, Inc. v. Domain Hostmaster, Customer ID No. 09382953107339 dba Whois Privacy Services Pty Ltd / Domain Administrator, Vertical Axis Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1754](#); *Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#)). The Panel also takes into account the content of the Website which makes explicit references to "rayaapp", including a download link, and the fact that Complainant's principal offering is the mobile app "Raya".

As regards bad faith use of the disputed domain name, Complainant has demonstrated that the disputed domain name was used to resolve to the Website, which prominently displayed Complainant's registered trademark, its company name in the copyright notice, thereby giving the false impression that it was operated by Complainant, or a company affiliated to Complainant or an authorised partner of Complainant. The disputed domain name was therefore used to intentionally create a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website it resolves to. This supports the finding of bad faith registration and use (*Booking.com BV v. Chen Guo Long*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0311](#); *Ebel International Limited v. Alan Brashear*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0001](#); *Walgreen Co. v. Muhammad Azeem / Wang Zheng, Nicenic International Group Co., Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1607](#); *Oculus VR, LLC v. Sean Lin*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2016-0034](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <rayaapp.xyz> be transferred to Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: April 2, 2026