

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Newcastle United Football Company Limited v. Justin R
Case No. D2026-1090

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Justin R, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nufc.store> 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 13, 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 16, 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/Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 18, 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 18, 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on April 24, 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

Established in 1892, the Complainant is a football club in the Premier League in England. The Complainant's trading names include "Newcastle United", "Newcastle United Football Club", and "NUFC", the last being an acronym of "Newcastle United Football Club". The Complainant owns the domain name <nufc.co.uk>, which redirects to its official website at "www.newcastleunited.com". The Complainant also uses an email address for its retail store associated with the domain name <nufc.co.uk>.

The Complainant is the owner of the following, amongst others, trademark registrations:

- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00001528422 for the word mark NUFC, filed on March 3, 1993, registered on March 24, 1995, successively renewed, in class 25; and
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00002149609 for the word mark NUFC, filed on October 30, 1997, registered on July 31, 1998, successively renewed, in classes 14, 21, 26, 28, 32, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 24, 2025, and resolves to a parked webpage offering it for sale for USD 1,450.

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 solely comprised of the NUFC trademark owned by the Complainant and therefore identical to it.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name given that:

- a) 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;
- b) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and
- c) 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 trademark at issue.

The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith given that it consist solely of the NUFC acronym and trademark; the Complainant sells a broad range of merchandise and the Complainant uses the domain name <nufc.co.uk> for email addresses such as the email address for its retail store which is [...]@nufc.co.uk; the composition of the disputed domain name likely to cause confusion and undue association, what further indicates that the disputed domain name was either registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or to impersonate the Complainant in an attempt to commit fraud.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

- (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 of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical 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.

In that sense, and according to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent, known as "Justin R", who has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and the Respondent is neither authorized, licensed, nor been allowed to use the Complainant's trademark, whether in the disputed domain name, or in any other way. Further, the disputed domain name has not been actively used apart from resolving to a parked page, offering it for sale. In addition, the case record does not show that the Respondent has any registered trademarks corresponding to the disputed domain name what further corroborates the indication of an absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

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.

This case presents the following circumstances which indicate on the balance of probabilities bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- a) the Respondent has provided no evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use by it of the disputed domain name;
- b) the Complainant and its NUFC trademark are widely known;
- c) the disputed domain name consists of the entirety of the Complainant's NUFC trademark, thus carrying a high risk of implied affiliation. The Top-Level Domain ".store" is closely related to the Complainant's business activity and the Complainant has also used an email address associated with the domain name <nufc.co.uk> for its own retail store; and
- d) the offer of the disputed domain name for sale at the price of USD 1,450 on the associated website indicates an amount most likely in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to registration of the disputed domain name.

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 <nufc.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/
Wilson Pinheiro Jabur
Sole Panelist
Date: May 5, 2026