

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Newcastle United Football Company Limited v. Name Redacted Case No. D2026-1011

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Newcastle United Football Company Limited, United Kingdom, represented by gunnercooke LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <newcastleunitedjersey.com> and <newcastleunitedshop.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 9, 2026. On March 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 13, 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 (Unknown / Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 13, 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 17, 2026.

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party without authorization when registering the disputed domain names. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain names, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 12, 2026. The Center received email communications from a third party on April 6 and 7, 2026 respectively, claiming its name and address had been used without its consent in registering the disputed domain names. On April 18, 2026, the Center notified the Parties it would commence its panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a football club established in 1892 and competes in the Premier League in England, United Kingdom. The Complainant operates under the trading name “Newcastle United”.

The Complainant is the proprietor of various registered trademarks for NEWCASTLE UNITED, including United Kingdom trademark number 3886183 registered on June 9, 2023, covering a broad range of classes typical of a professional football club; European Union trademark number 8285637 registered on December 1, 2009; and United States of America trademark number 7160806 registered on September 12, 2023.

The Complainant operates its official website at “www.newcastleunited.com”.

The disputed domain names were registered on June 9, 2024. Both disputed domain names resolved, at the time of filing the Complaint and at the time of rendering this Decision, to the virtually identical websites that purportedly offer Newcastle United merchandise and have the similar look and feel as the Complainant’s official 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

Given the facts, when the Respondent registered the disputed domain names, the Respondent would have been aware of the Complainant and that the Complainant owns and uses the domain name <newcastleunited.com> and sells a broad range of merchandise.

The circumstances indicate that the disputed domain names were registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain names to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain names; or the disputed domain names were registered for the purpose of disrupting the business of the Complainant; and/or to attempt to attract for commercial gain Internet users to websites operated by the Respondent by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites or of a product or service on the Respondent's websites; and/or to impersonate the Complainant in an attempt to commit fraud.

B. Respondent

A third party has indicated that it is the victim of identity theft. The third party mentions that its name and address have been used in registering the disputed domain names. The third party further indicates that it does not have any connection with the Complainant or any other football or soccer club.

The Respondent did not reply to 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 names. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here "jersey" and "shop", 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 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation and the operation of a copycat site 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 disputed domain names resolve to the virtually identical websites that purportedly offer Newcastle United merchandise and have the similar look and feel as the Complainant's official website. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has clearly registered and used the disputed domain names for the purpose of intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Panels have held that that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation and the operation of a copycat site, 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 constitutes 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 names <newcastleunitedjersey.com> and <newcastleunitedshop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: May 4, 2026