

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

### **X Corp. v. Host Master / Njalla Okta LLC**

### **Case No. D2026-1030**

#### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is X Corp., United States of America (“U.S.”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

#### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <xchatbeta.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

#### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 10, 2026. On March 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 13, 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 (Privacy-Protected Registrant of xchatbeta.com (John Doe)) and contact information in the Complaint.

On March 19 and 23, 2026, the Center sent emails to the Complainant regarding a number of missing formalities in the Complaint and requesting the Complainant to submit an amended complaint, which the Complainant did on March 19 and 24, 2026.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 25, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not file a new amended Complaint.

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 April 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 globally recognized technology company operating in the field of social media, digital communications, and related online services. It is widely known for its rebranding and consolidation of services under the designation “X”, which has acquired significant notoriety and distinctiveness in connection with online communication platforms and associated technological developments.

The record indicates that the Complainant is the owner of a portfolio of trademark applications incorporating the sign “X” and stylized variants thereof, including U.S. Serial Nos. 98193518 filed on September 22, 2023, 98295590 filed on December 1, 2023, 98295593 filed on December 1, 2023, 98295599 filed on December 1, 2023, and 98295606 filed on December 1, 2023.

Although these filings are pending, the Panel notes that the Complainant also has registered trademarks, such as X X CORP, U.S. Registration No. 7481191, registered on August 20, 2024. Moreover, the Complainant contends its rights are also grounded in extensive prior use and recognition of the “X” mark, which functions as a distinctive identifier of the Complainant’s services.

The disputed domain name <xchatbeta.com> was registered on December 1, 2025. The Registrar’s verification further disclosed that the underlying registrant is “Njalla Okta LLC”, replacing the initially indicated privacy-protected identity.

The evidence on record demonstrates that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that reproduces several elements associated with the Complainant, including use of “X Chat Beta”, a misleading copyright notice, replicated structure, and a user interface inviting Internet users to submit their email addresses to access a purported service.

The record also includes a cease-and-desist letter sent by the Complainant on March 9, 2026. The available evidence indicates that the disputed domain name remained active thereafter.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its “X” mark, incorporating the mark in its entirety together with the terms “chat” and “beta”, which reference the Complainant’s X Chat beta product.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests and is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, nor engaged in any bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent’s conduct, including replication of website elements, misleading copyright notice, and operation of an email collection interface, demonstrates an attempt to exploit the Complainant’s reputation.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, including in circumstances suggesting an attempt to obtain user data under misleading pretenses.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Policy, in its paragraph 4(a), determines that three elements must be present and duly proven by a complainant to obtain relief. These elements are:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to 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 of the Policy 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 Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated rights in the "X" mark for purposes of the Policy. While certain trademark applications referenced in the record are pending, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established relevant rights based on use and recognition of the mark, consistent with [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. In this regard, the Panel also notes the distinctive "X" element of the Complainant's registered X X CORP trademark.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark "X" as its leading and dominant element. The addition of the terms "chat" and "beta" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

As consistently held in prior UDRP decisions, the addition of descriptive or otherwise non-distinctive terms to a complainant's mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests with the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests may involve the difficult task of proving a negative. Accordingly, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the Complainant's mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that it has acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the term "X Chat Beta" or any similar designation.

Moreover, the evidence on record shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that reproduces elements of the Complainant's branding and invites users to submit personal data under the guise of a purported service. Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation or misleading conduct, including schemes designed to induce users to disclose personal information, cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

In the absence of any Response, 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 the disputed domain name.

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) sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may evidence registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct falls within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's mark together with terms directly referring to its services, indicates clear targeting of the Complainant.

The associated website reproduces elements of the Complainant's branding and falsely suggests affiliation, including through the use of a misleading copyright notice and a simulated "beta" access mechanism.

Such conduct is indicative of an attempt to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark for commercial gain or other illegitimate purposes.

The Panel further considers that the operation of a data collection interface under these circumstances suggests an attempt to obtain user data under misleading pretenses.

In the absence of any plausible explanation from the Respondent, and having regard to the totality of the circumstances, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 domain name <xchatbeta.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira/*

**Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 22, 2026