ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Namecheap Inc. v. Mahamudul Hasan
Case No. D2026-0921

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Namecheap Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Rome LLP., United States.

The Respondent is Mahamudul Hasan, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <namecheapbd.com> is registered with Register SPA (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 3, 2026. On March 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 5, 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 (Domain Proxy Service, Domain Proxy Service. LCN.com Limited) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 5, 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 March 5, 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 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 March 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Torsten Bettinger as the sole panelist in this matter on April 7, 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, established in 2000 in Phoenix, Arizona, United States, is an ICANN-accredited domain name registrar and web hosting provider. It is currently among the largest domain name registrars worldwide, managing a portfolio of more than 20 million domain names.

The Complainant owns trademark rights worldwide for or including NAMECHEAP, such as the following:

- the European Union Trademark Registration number 018412308 for NAMECHEAP (word), filed on March 2, 2021, registered on September 8, 2021, covering services in International Classes 35, 42, 45;

- the United States Trademark Registration number 4213990 for NAMECHEAP (word), filed on February 29, 2012, registered on September 25, 2012, covering services in International Classes 35, 39, 42, 45; and

- the United States Trademark Registration number 3622358 for NAMECHEAP.COM (word), filed on September 26, 2008, registered on May 19, 2009, covering services in International Class 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 3, 2025. It resolves (as of March 3, 2026) to a commercial website operating under the name “Namecheap BD”.

The site offers domain name registration, web hosting, SSL certificates, and related services. The website prominently uses the designation “Namecheap BD” and provides domain search functionality, pricing for common TLDs (e.g., “.com”, “.net”, “.org”), and various hosting plans and support services.

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.

With regard to the requirement of “identity or confusing similarity between the trademark and the domain name” pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant contends that

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the NAMECHEAP Marks as It incorporates the NAMECHEAP mark in its entirety as the first and dominant element, followed only by the letters “bd” and the generic “.com” top-level domain;
- the addition of the suffix “bd” to NAMECHEAP is non-distinctive and does not create a new or different commercial impression.

With regard to the Respondent having no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant submitted that,

- Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to notice of this dispute, but instead to promote directly competing registrar and hosting services under a confusingly similar name;
- Respondent has never been commonly known by “Namecheap” or by the disputed domain name;
- Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, but instead a commercial use intended to divert Namecheap’s customers;

- Respondent is not affiliated with Namecheap, and Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted Respondent to register or use any domain name incorporating the NAMECHEAP Marks;
- Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Rather, Respondent is using a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's NAMECHEAP Marks to promote services that compete with Complainant's own services.

Finally, with regard to the disputed domain name having been registered and being used in bad faith, the Complainant argues that,

- Complainant's NAMECHEAP Marks long pre-date Respondent's registration of <namecheapbd.com>;
- the very composition of the disputed domain name—Complainant's NAMECHEAP mark plus a non-distinctive geographic suffix ("bd")—combined with Respondent's use of the domain for domain registration and hosting-related services, evidences Respondent's knowledge of Complainant and intent to target the NAMECHEAP Marks and trade on Complainant's goodwill;
- Respondent's decision to conceal its identity behind a privacy service, while simultaneously targeting a well-known mark in the same industry, further supports a finding of bad-faith registration;
- Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, by intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's NAMECHEAP Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website and services;
- by using a domain name that is nearly identical to NAMECHEAP to offer the same categories of services, Respondent is plainly seeking to trade on Complainant's reputation and divert consumers who intend to reach Namecheap, exactly the type of conduct Paragraph 4(b)(iv) is intended to address;
- Respondent's actions are likely to damage the NAMECHEAP Marks and Complainant's goodwill.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant must prove each of the three following elements:

(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.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The 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 disputed domain name incorporates the NAMECHEAP mark in its entirety as its leading and dominant element.

The additional letters "bd" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. (Such a suffix is commonly understood as meaning "business development" or potentially a geographic abbreviation (in this case, for Bangladesh).)

Furthermore, it is well established that the applicable top-level domain ".com" is a technical requirement of registration and is disregarded for the purpose of the confusing similarity analysis.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's NAMECHEAP mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 recognized that proving 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 name.

The Complainant has credibly asserted that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the NAMECHEAP mark, whether as part of a domain name or otherwise. There is no evidence on the record indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Nor does the Panel find that the Respondent is making a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website branded as "Namecheap BD," which offers domain name registration, web hosting, and related services that directly compete with those of the Complainant.

The use of the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name and on the website creates a misleading impression of affiliation or endorsement. Such use, which trades on the goodwill of the Complainant's mark to attract Internet users for commercial gain, cannot be considered bona fide.

Furthermore, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The website is clearly commercial in nature, offering services for sale and seeking to capitalize on the reputation of the Complainant's mark.

In the absence of any Response or other evidence to the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

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.

At the time of registration of the disputed domain name on August 3, 2025, the Complainant's NAMECHEAP mark was already well established and widely used in connection with domain name registration and hosting services. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the NAMECHEAP mark together with the suffix "bd" (which the Panel considers potentially a reference to "business development" or Bangladesh).

In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its mark. Rather, the composition of the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and sought to create the impression of a localized or affiliated version of the Complainant's services.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website branded as "Namecheap BD", which offers domain name registration, web hosting, SSL certificates, and related services that directly compete with those of the Complainant.

By using the Complainant's mark in the disputed domain name and on the associated website, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The use of a privacy or proxy service to conceal the identity of the underlying registrant, while not in itself conclusive of bad faith, may in the circumstances of this case reinforce the inference of bad faith, particularly where the Respondent is engaged in a competing commercial activity under a name that incorporates the Complainant's mark.

In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, and taking into account the overall circumstances of the case, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <namecheapbd.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Torsten Bettinger/
Torsten Bettinger
Sole Panelist
Date: April 21, 2026