

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Travelscape, LLC v. Baisheng Kenny, Indian Tech Corporation - ITC
Case No. D2026-0890

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Travelscape, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Baisheng Kenny, Indian Tech Corporation - ITC, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <travelocity-agentportal.com>, <travelo-city-nepal.com> and <travelocity-portal.com> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 28, 2026. On March 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 3, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 3, 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 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Gareth Dickson as the sole panelist in this matter on April 20, 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 Travelscape, LLC, a travel services company based in Seattle, Washington, United States. The Complainant is owned by Expedia, Inc. and operates as a provider of consumer-direct travel services, offering airline, car rental, hotel, vacation package, tour and cruise reservations through, inter alia, the website at the domain name <travelocity.com>, which was launched in 1996.

The Complainant is the owner or licensee of a number of trade mark registrations for TRAVELOCITY (the “Mark”) and TRAVELOCITY-formative marks, which it has used since March 12, 1996, including the following:

- United States Registration No. 2,254,700 for TRAVELOCITY (word mark), registered on June 22, 1999, in International Classes 35, 39, and 42;
- United States Registration No. 2,466,132 for TRAVELOCITY (word mark), registered on July 3, 2001, in International Classes 35, 38, 39, and 42; and
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000163642, registered on September 14, 2001, in International Classes 9 and 39.

The Complainant also owns trade mark registrations for the Mark in other jurisdictions around the world, including Hong Kong, China, Australia, Canada, and Mexico.

The Complainant’s website at the domain name <travelocity.com> has received an average of over 5.1 million visits per month since November 2024 and is ranked among the top travel and tourism websites in the United States. The Complainant’s brand has received numerous industry awards, including recognition as the “World’s Leading Online Travel Agency” between 2013 and 2022 and the United States’ Leading Online Travel Agency between 2021 and 2024.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows:

- <travelocity-agentportal.com> and <travelocity-portal.com> were registered on June 14, 2025; and
- <travelo-city-nepal.com> was registered on September 4, 2025.

Each registration date is more than 25 years after the Complainant first used the Mark and after the Complainant registered the Mark. All three disputed domain names are registered with the same registrar and identify the same registrant on the Whois.

At present, the disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites without any content. Prior to that, the disputed domain names resolved to websites which impersonated the Complainant by inviting Internet users to log into the Complainant’s services via a portal, using the Mark and the TRAVELOCITY & Stars Design logo and by claiming to be Travelscape LLC in the copyright notice.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Mark, as each incorporates the entirety of the Mark with only the addition of one or more hyphens together with generic or geographic terms (“agentportal”, “portal”, and/or “nepal”), and the generic Top-Level-Domain “.com”.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, asserting that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, that there is no relationship between the parties giving rise to any licence or permission, and that the Respondent has not made any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent used the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant in a phishing scheme designed to obtain users’ login credentials.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent must have known of the Mark since it is coined and therefore inherently distinctive and is well-known, and because the disputed domain names were used to impersonate the Complainant as part of an apparent phishing scheme. It notes that the Respondent’s current passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The Complainant originally filed its Complaint in relation to nominally different domain name registrants, whose precise identification was at that stage unknown. The Complainant requested the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, on the basis that the domain name registrants were the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control.

The disputed domain name registrant/s did not comment on the Complainant’s request.

Since then, the precise identity of the registrant of the disputed domain names has been disclosed by their respective registrars, as required. These disclosures show that the disputed domain names are in fact under the control of a single individual and, as such, the Complainant’s request for consolidation becomes straightforward: paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

For completeness, however, the Panel has considered whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that all three disputed domain names share identical registrant contact details (name, organization, address, telephone number, and email address), as confirmed by the Registrar’s verification response. The disputed domain names were registered with the same Registrar and use the same DNS service provider (Cloudflare). Each disputed domain name previously resolved to websites of the same type, being websites impersonating the Complainant using the same layout and photograph. Each disputed domain name incorporates the Mark in its entirety and modifies it in the same way, namely through use of a hyphen and generic or geographic terms. These circumstances are consistent with those identified by prior UDRP panels as supporting a finding of common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes and refers below to “the Respondent” as the registrant of the three disputed domain names.

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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Mark is recognisable within each of the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The Panel also notes that the inclusion of the gTLD “.com” is disregarded as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11

Although the addition of hyphens, either after “travelocity” or between “travelo” and “city”, and the terms “agentportal”, “portal”, and “nepal”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 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 recognised 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names, that it has made any bona fide offering of goods or services, or that it has made any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Complainant confirms that it has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Mark or to register any domain name incorporating it.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed (and appearing) to be phishing or identity theft and impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names incorporating the Mark in its entirety long after the Mark had become well-known and had been registered as a trade mark. The Mark is a coined term with no dictionary meaning. The disputed domain names were registered over 25 years after the Complainant began using the Mark. Even absent the Complainant's evidence that the Respondent was using the disputed domain names to phish for the Complainant's customers' log in details, it is difficult to conceive of any good-faith reason why the Respondent would have registered domain names incorporating the Mark in its entirety, together with terms such as "agentportal", "portal", and "nepal", other than to create a false association with the Complainant and to attract Internet users to the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark. The inclusion of one or more hyphens into a disputed domain name does not alter this conclusion.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed (and appearing) to be phishing or identity theft and impersonation/passing off, 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 names constitute bad faith under the Policy. The fact that, at present, the disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites without any content does not prevent a finding of 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 names <travelocity-agentportal.com>, <travelo-city-nepal.com>, and <travelocity-portal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gareth Dickson/

Gareth Dickson

Sole Panelist

Date: May 4, 2026