

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Abu Talha, Registrar 360
Case No. D2026-0819

1. The Parties

1.1 The Complainant is Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL c/o Walters Law Group, United States of America (“United States”) (the “Complainant”).

1.2 The Respondent is Abu Talha, Registrar 360, Bangladesh (the “Respondent”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

2.1 The disputed domain name <megapersonals.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Global Domain Group LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 25, 2026. On February 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On February 27, 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, Global Domain Group Privacy Service) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 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 an amendment to the Complaint on February 27, 2026.

3.2 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”).

3.3 In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 25, 2026.

3.4 The Center appointed Ike Ehiribe as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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.

3.5 On March 31, 2026, the Respondent sent two communications addressed to the Center.

4. Factual Background

4.1 The Complainant is a Romanian corporation based in Bucharest, Romania. At all material times the Complainant has been engaged in the provision of Internet-based social introduction and dating services. In the course of providing and promoting its services the Complainant has made extensive use of its MEGAPERSONALS trademark. The Complainant registered its trademark with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) on July 27, 2021, in International Class 45 under the trademark registration number 6432591. The Complainant also owns and operates a number of websites incorporating its trademark with which its services have been routinely provided such as <megapersonals.com> and <megapersonals.eu>.

4.2 The Respondent is Abu Talha, Registrar 360, based in Bangladesh. The Respondent created the Disputed Domain Name <megapersonals.com> on October 16, 2025. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant and offers goods and services that are in direct competition with the same goods and services offered by the Complainant.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

5.1 The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

5.2 Notably, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark as the Disputed Domain Name is a typosquatted version of the Complainant’s mark and <megapersonals.eu> domain name which includes an “s” between “p” and “e”. It is further submitted that a disputed domain name which consists of an obvious or intentional misspelling of a well-known trademark would be considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant trademark for purposes of establishing the first element. See in support, *Avid Dating Life Inc. v. Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC / Online Management*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0460](#). Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the addition of the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.com” to the Disputed Domain Name is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity test following WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition¹, section 1.11.1.

5.3 The Complainant in addition asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name considering that the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant nor has the Respondent received any authorization, consent whether implied or express, to use the Complainant’s trademark in the Disputed Domain Name or in any other manner. It is further contended that once the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests, the burden shifts onto the Respondent to provide evidence that it has rights to, or legitimate interests in, the Disputed Domain Name following *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0624](#). Thus, as the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website through which goods and services in direct competition with the Complainant are provided to Internet users, and considering the Respondent went as far as designing the

¹ WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, was superseded by WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”) on February 18, 2026, with no substantive change to section 1.11.1.

website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves to mimic the appearance of the Complainant's services with the Complainant's logo placed thereon, such activity cannot be referred to as evidence of rights and legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. See in support, a number of previous UDRP decisions such as *Guardant, Inc. v. Jeff Park*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0631](#); *General Motors LLC v. Cann, Jay*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1789](#).

5.4 It is further submitted that insofar as the Respondent is utilizing the Disputed Domain Name to direct Internet users to a website offering illegal services, such use cannot be considered to be a bona fide offering of goods and services. See in support, *Fenix International Limited v. Leandro Vinicius Bau*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0584](#).

5.5 On the question of bad faith use and registration, the Complainant submits that the Respondent created the Disputed Domain Name with the intention of diverting Internet traffic to the Complainant's competitors considering that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's trademark rights when it registered the Disputed Domain Name on October 16, 2025. Thus, it is further submitted that by registering a confusingly similar Disputed Domain Name and operating a website that offers the same services offered by the Complainant, bad faith has been established. See *Guardant, Inc. v. Jeff Park, supra*. Furthermore the Respondent's failure to respond to a letter demanding that the Respondent desist from using the Disputed Domain Name and transfer same to the Complainant, is further evidence of bad faith use. See in support, *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. v. John Zuccarini and The Cupcake Patrol a/k/a Country Walk a/k/a Cupcake Party*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0330](#). It is stated that the Respondent's use of a privacy service combined with the stated failure to respond to the Complaint's letter of demand is further evidence of bad faith registration and use. See in support WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, section 3.6. In further support of bad faith use and registration, the Complainant asserts that since the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website that is designed to deceive the Complainant's users into unknowingly providing their log-in credentials to the Respondent for phishing purposes, bad faith use is clearly established following *Swedbank AB v. Itai Mukonyora*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2019-0044](#).

B. Respondent

5.6 The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On March 31, 2026, the Respondent sent two communications to the Center, which read in their entirety: "Sir, I am forwarding the case to the client and I will update you shortly" and "Sir, The client said that the domain is already inactivated".

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

6.1 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.

6.2 The Complainant has established registered rights in respect of the MEGAPERSONALS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. In addition, the Complainant has referred to well over ten previous UDRP decisions that have recognized the Complainant's rights in its MEGAPERSONALS trademark the most recent being the decision in *Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Mohd Khan*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4010](#).

6.3 The Panel finds on a visual examination that 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 despite the obvious misspelling occasioned by placing an "s" between "p" and "e". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7. and 1.9.

6.4 The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

6.5 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.

6.6 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, as has been the case in these proceedings, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

6.7 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.

6.8 Panels have in addition held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as, as claimed in this case phishing/identity theft, and/or copycat site, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

6.9 The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

6.10 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.

6.11 In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent created the Disputed Domain Name on October 16, 2025, several years after the Complainant’s registration of its MEGAPERSONALS trademark on July 27, 2021. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant’s trademark when the Disputed Domain Name was created considering that the Respondent utilized the said Disputed Domain Name to create a copycat version of the Complainant’s website with the Complainant’s logo placed thereon. The Panel finds that the Respondent’s activities in this regard are all together indicative of irrefutable evidence of bad faith registration and continued bad faith use with the intention of disrupting the Complainant’s business for commercial gain.

6.12 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.

6.13 Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (such as, as claimed in this case phishing/identity theft, and copycat site) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitute bad faith under the Policy. The Panel finds further that the Respondent’s refusal to respond to the Complainant’s letter of demand, demanding that the Complainant stop using the Disputed Domain Name, and the Respondent’s reliance on a privacy service to shield its identity are in addition indicative of bad faith

registration and continued bad faith use.

6.14 The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

7.1 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 <megapsersonals.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ike Ehiribe/

Ike Ehiribe

Sole Panelist

Date: April 14, 2026