ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc v. Nick Matt
Case No. D2026-1031

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, United Kingdom, represented by Kilburn & Strode, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Nick Matt, Philippines.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bloomsburyacquisition.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 10, 2026. On March 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 11, 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 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 12, 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 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi 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 an English company incorporated in 1986, which has been publishing books with offices in London, New York, New Delhi, Oxford and Sydney.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the BLOOMSBURY such as:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. 905227715 for BLOOMSBURY, registered on July 28, 2006;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 005227715 for BLOOMSBURY, registered on July 17, 2007; and
- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 3779055 for BLOOMSBURY, registered on April 20, 2010.

The Complainant also owns a domain name incorporating its BLOOMSBURY mark, that is, <bloomsbury.com> registered on March 15, 1996, which has been used as its online retail business.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 30, 2025. It resolves to a page displaying “Launching Soon”, “Contact Us”, “Drop us a line!”, “Name”, “Email”, “Message” and a box to “Sign up for our email list for updates, promotions, and more”. Emails were dispatched on February 15 and 23, 2026, from “[…]@ bloomsburyacquisition.com” to a potential customer of the Complainant claiming to offer book deals. These emails impersonated an employee of the Complainant.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not made any substantive arguments in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant’s contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

(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 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 Complainant's BLOOMSBURY mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The additional term "acquisition" and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element test. 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 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 that use of the disputed domain name as an email address from which fraudulent emails have been dispatched prevents a finding of right or legitimate interests for the Respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.

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, noting the composition of the disputed domain name, the fact that the Complainant has been doing business under the BLOOMSBURY brand and has had such trademark registered for decades, the Panel finds it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's BLOOMSBURY trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name on November 30, 2025. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

With regard to the requirement that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, the Panel finds in this case that the messages on the page resolved by the disputed domain name would be able to collect name, email address and others of potential customers of the Complainant who believe the page is managed by the Complainant. The Panel also finds that the disputed domain name has been used as an email address from which fraudulent emails have been dispatched. These facts are enough to show that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith.

The Panel finds 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 disputed domain name <bloomsburyacquisition.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/
Masato Dogauchi
Sole Panelist
Date: April 17, 2026