

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Newcastle United Football Company Limited v. Angela Monet
Case No. D2026-1046

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Angela Monet, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <newcastleunited.store> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Name Dot Store Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 11, 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 12, 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 (Unknown) 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 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 proceedings commenced on March 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion 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

The Complainant, Newcastle United Football Company Limited, is a football club in the Premier League in England established in 1892. The Complainant is the holder of various registered trademarks, including the following:

- NEWCASTLE UNITED, European Union Trade Mark registered on December 1, 2009, under registration number 8285637 in classes 6, 16, 18 and 25.

The Disputed Domain Name <newcastleunited.store> was registered on February 17, 2026, and appears to be inactive.

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 identical to registered trademarks in which it has rights.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. According to the Complainant:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, there is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name; and
- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trade mark or service mark at issue.

Finally, the Complainant considers that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and being used in bad faith. In summary, the Complainant contends that:

- when it registered the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent would have been aware of the Complainant, that the Complainant owns and uses the domain name <newcastleunited.com> in the course of its business and that it sells a broad range of merchandise from its online store, as well as from physical stores;
- as the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the suffix ".store", there is a significant risk of financial fraud being committed against members of the public if the Disputed Domain Name is used in email phishing scams or other online fraud.

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 observes that the entirety of the NEWCASTLE UNITED mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. In such cases, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to the incorporated mark for purposes of UDRP standing. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

It is well established that generic Top-Level-Domains ("gTLDs"), here ".store", may be disregarded when considering whether the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

The Panel finds that 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not apparently been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is "Angela Monet". The Respondent's use and registration of the Disputed Domain Name was not authorized by the Complainant.

Fundamentally, a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. The correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often the central starting point to this inquiry. Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's NEWCASTLE UNITED trademark in its entirety, merely removing the space between the two words just like the domain name <newcastleunited.com> linked to the Complainant's official website. In addition, the Panel finds that the ".store" gTLD can even increase the risk for confusion as it can be considered to refer to an online store of

the Complainant. According to the Panel, the Disputed Domain Name carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and cannot constitute fair use.

Beyond looking at the domain name and the nature of any additional terms appended to it, UDRP panels assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and the absence of a response, support a fair use or not. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

The Disputed Domain Name does not appear to resolve to an active web page. In the Panel's view, this does not amount to any legitimate noncommercial or fair use or use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services either.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate his rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

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.

The Panel finds that the following circumstances serve as indication of bad faith registration and use:

- the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive trademark in its entirety, merely combining it with a gTLD which can increase the confusion and implied affiliation with the Complainant's business;
- the Complainant's trademark covering the country of location of the Respondent predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by more than 15 years;
- the Respondent did not take part in the administrative proceedings.

Given the totality of the circumstances discussed above, the fact that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive webpage does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Based on the available record, 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 <newcastleunited.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/

Flip Jan Claude Petillion

Sole Panelist

Date: April 29, 2026