ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Barclays Bank UK PLC v. Adomas Vaidakavicius
Case No. D2026-0935

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Barclays Bank UK PLC, United Kingdom, represented by Bird & Bird, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Adomas Vaidakavicius, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <barclayshr.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 4, 2026. On March 5, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 9, 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 11, 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 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Catherine Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on April 14, 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 wholly owned subsidiary of Barclays PLC, a British multinational banking and financial services company headquartered in London and one of the world's largest financial services providers with operations in retail, wholesale and investment banking, wealth management, mortgage lending and credit cards. The Complainant is responsible for Barclays PLC's retail operations providing products and services to 24 million individual and business customers in the United Kingdom. The Complainant also operates in more than 50 overseas territories where it has a further approximately 24 million customers.

The Complainant is the licensee of numerous registered trademarks throughout the world containing or incorporating BARCLAYS including the following:

-United States of America Trademark No. 3049848 for BARCLAYS (plain word mark), registered on January 24, 2006;

-United Kingdom Trademark No. 2461096 for the BARCLAYS (plain word mark), registered on January 11, 2008;

-European Union Trademark No. 2315554 for the BARCLAYS (plain word mark), registered on February 13, 2003;

The Complainant operates a website at <www.barclays.co.uk>.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 17, 2022.

On November 28, 2024, the disputed domain names resolved to a 'parking page'. At date of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any webpage.

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark because it incorporates that trademark and merely adds the suffix "hr" which strengthens the likely inference given the Complainant's employment of approximately 85,000 people. The suffix is likely to confuse and attract the attention of the Complainant's customers and also individuals seeking employment via the Complainant's human resources department.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because the Respondent does not hold any relevant trademarks or other intellectual property rights, the disputed domain does not appear to have been used for website and the Respondent could not in any event use the disputed domain name for any legitimate purpose.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because it is clear that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name for the purpose of unfairly disrupting the Complainant's business by confusing Internet users into thinking that the disputed domain name is connected with the Complainant, the active MX and SPF records suggest that the disputed domain name is likely to be used for the purpose of sending fraudulent emails, the Respondent's actions are contrary to paragraph 4((b)(iv) of the Policy and there is no legitimate use to which the Respondent could put the disputed domain name because it will always create an association with the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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 another term here, "hr", 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 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 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 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

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 finds that the Complainant's trademark is well known. Taking this fact into account together with the fact that the disputed domain name reproduces the trademark identically and that the Respondent has provided no explanation for its selection of the disputed domain name, the Panel infers that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark in mind, and with the intention of profiting from, or otherwise exploiting, the goodwill attaching to that trademark.

The Panel finds the disputed domain name to be inherently misleading, as inevitably suggesting to Internet users that it is affiliated in some manner with the Complainant. While the Respondent's ultimate intention with regard to the disputed domain name is not known, the Panel can conceive of no use that the Respondent could make of the disputed domain name without causing confusion with the Complainant's trademark and taking unfair advantage of, and/or causing unfair detriment to, that trademark.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use and indeed the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <barclayshr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Catherine Slater/
Catherine Slater
Sole Panelist
Date: April 24, 2026