ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Sling Media LLC v. xianling qiu
Case No. D2026-0821

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sling Media LLC, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by Quarles & Brady LLP, United States.

The Respondent is xianling qiu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <slingtvbox.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 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, 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 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 amended Complaint on March 3, 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 March 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 1, 2026.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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 U.S. Corporation, which is a well-known provider of over-the-top Internet television services, audio, video, and multimedia equipment and software.

Since at least 2005, the Complainant, its licensees, and/or predecessors-in-interest have used numerous marks comprising the trademark SLING or trademarks including SLING, such as SLING MEDIA, SLING SCAPES, SLING BOX, SLING PLAYER, SLING TELEVISION, SLING TV, SLINGTV and SLING STUDIO in connection with its over- the-top television and other products and services.

The Complainant has provided details of numerous trademark registrations in its trademark portfolio, including U.S. Registration No, 3719986, registered on December 1, 2009, in respect of the trademark SLING, U.S. Registration No. 3402927, registered on March 25, 2008 in respect of the trademark SLINGBOX, and U.S. Registration No. 5481329, registered on May 29, 2008, in respect of the trademark SLING TV.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 8, 2024, and resolves to a website offering services directly competing with those offered by the Complainant.

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, to the best of its knowledge, the Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark SLING or any of its other trademarks in connection with the registration of a domain name, or otherwise.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similarity

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark SLING 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 Panel finds, in the circumstances of the present case, that the addition of “tvbox” to SLING in the disputed domain name 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 Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interest

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 finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds it implausible that the disputed domain name was registered without the Complainant in mind, and considers that the usage of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website offering services similar to those offered by the Complainant, using the Complainant’s trademark confirms this doubt. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

It is well-established in prior panel decisions under the Policy that the use of a disputed domain name to compete unfairly with a complainant constitutes use of a domain name in bad faith. In the circumstances of the present case the disputed domain name clearly suggests affiliation with the Complainant, and the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain through confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products promoted therein. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

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 <slingtvbox.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/George R. F. Souter/
George R. F. Souter
Sole Panelist
Date: April 29, 2026