ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Eastern Aviation Fuels, Inc. v. Kobie Italo, TB&J COURIER SERVICES LTD
Case No. D2026-0946

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Eastern Aviation Fuels, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Kobie Italo, TB&J COURIER SERVICES LTD, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <titanaviafuels.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 5, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 10, 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 (Global Domain Group Privacy Service) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 12, 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 13, 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 proceeding commenced on March 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 10, 2026

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a company founded in the United States in 1975, carrying on business as a supplier of aviation fuels under the trade mark TITAN AVIATION FUELS (the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant is the owner of registration Nos. 5782192 and 6660720 for the Trade Mark in the United States, with registration dates of June 18, 2019, and March 1, 2022, respectively.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is reportedly a company located in the United Kingdom.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name <titanaviafuels.com> was registered on November 6, 2025.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was previously resolved to an English language website, containing content scraped from the official website of a competitor of the Complainant, AEGFUELS, in combination with the Trade Mark and other language impersonating and referencing the Complainant (the "Website").

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name is no longer resolved to an active website.

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 Respondent has used the disputed domain name illegitimately in respect of the Website, in order to impersonate both the Complainant and its competitor, AEGFUELS, and likely engage in phishing or other unlawful conduct.

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 trade mark 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 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 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) 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 constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain name is no longer resolved to an active website 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 name <titanaviafuels.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/
Sebastian M.W. Hughes
Sole Panelist
Date: April 29, 2026