ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Coretech It, UAB v. he jie
Case No. D2026-1114

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Coretech It, UAB, Lithuania, internally represented.

The Respondent is he jie, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <oxylabsproxy.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 16, 2026. On March 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 17, 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 ("Redacted for Privacy") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 17, 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 17, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on April 13, 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 proxy server provider based in Lithuania that operates under the OXYLABS and its figurative X marks.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for these marks, including:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 017875311, OXYLABS (word), registered on June 30, 2018;

- International Trademark Registration No. 1435242, OXYLABS (word), registered on April 11, 2018, designating, among other jurisdictions, China;

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018412320, X (figurative), registered on July 28, 2021, with the following graphic representation:



- United States Trademark Registration No. 7021164, X (figurative), registered on April 11, 2023, with the following graphic representation:



Hereinafter collectively referred to as the "OXYLABS Mark" and the "X Mark", respectively.

In addition, the Complainant is the owner of domain names corresponding to the OXYLABS Mark, including <oxylabs.io>, which resolves to its official international website, and <oxylabs.cn>, which resolves to its official website for the Chinese market.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 2, 2025, and is currently inactive, resolving to an Internet browser error message indicating that "This site can't be reached". However, according to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name previously resolved to an English-language website displaying the OXYLABS Mark and a version of the X Mark at its header, in a similar shade of green, and purportedly offering proxy server services. This website featured a design and color scheme—green and black on a white background—similar to that of the Complainant's official website at "www.oxylabs.io". The website did not include any information regarding its owner or the registrant of the disputed domain name, nor did it contain any disclaimer or reference indicating a lack of affiliation with the Complainant or its trademarks.

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 confusingly similar to its OXYLABS Mark and to its domain name <oxylabs.io>, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety, followed by the term "proxy", which refers to services offered by the Complainant and therefore increases the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as it has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the owner of the OXYLABS and X Marks, thereby creating confusion for commercial gain and seeking to benefit from the reputation of these marks in the proxy server services sector.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith, with the intention of deliberately misleading consumers into believing that they are dealing with the Complainant, which enjoys a reputation as a reliable provider, and of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's business for unlawful commercial purposes. The Respondent's website prominently displayed the OXYLABS Mark and a confusingly similar figurative X Mark, demonstrating a clear intention to mislead consumers and create a false association with the Complainant. The Respondent has thus free-ridden on the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks and has unlawfully diluted that reputation, exposing users to potential harm, including the risk of providing personal data and engaging in illicit activities, as well as the risk that users' personal data and funds may be misused for unlawful purposes. Following the Complainant's submission of documentary evidence of its trademark rights to the Registrar, the disputed domain name was deactivated and is currently inactive. However, the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant is necessary to prevent any future unauthorized reactivation, use, or transfer to third parties.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant has submitted all relevant assertions under the Policy, and the dispute properly falls within its scope. The Panel has the authority to decide the dispute by examining the three elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into account all relevant evidence, annexed materials, and submissions. The Panel may also conduct limited independent research pursuant to its general powers, as provided, inter alia, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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, namely the OXYLABS Mark and the X Mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the OXYLABS Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name followed by the term "proxy". The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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, the term "proxy", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Therefore, 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 the term "oxylabs" is a coined term that is not found in any dictionary, and that nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by this term, or by the terms "oxylabsproxy" or "oxylabs proxy". The Respondent's name, as disclosed by the Registrar verification, bears no similarity to these terms. In addition, the Panel has confirmed through a search of the Global Brand Database that the Respondent holds no trademark rights in respect of these terms.[1]

The Panel further finds that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent, nor does it cure its prior unlawful use.

[1] Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated, inter alia, in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.8.

The Panel notes that, according to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name was used to impersonate the Complainant and its business through a website that prominently displayed its trademarks and employed a design and colour scheme similar to those used on the Complainant's official websites, thereby deliberately creating a risk of user confusion and a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant. Such conduct constitutes unlawful activity and cannot give rise to any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 Panel has confirmed that Internet searches for the term "oxylabs" consistently return results referring to the Complainant, its prior rights, and its proxy server services business.

The Panel further notes the distinctiveness of the OXYLABS Mark and the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the OXYLABS Mark followed by a term referring to the same sector in which the Complainant uses the mark.

Additionally, the fact that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website that not only prominently displayed the OXYLABS Mark and a similar version of the X Mark, using a comparable colour scheme and design, but also targeted the same proxy server services sector, makes it evident that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration and intentionally targeted it in bad faith.

The Respondent's website attempted to impersonate the Complainant in order to derive unfair commercial benefit from this false association.

Accordingly, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy. In particular, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the services offered therein, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, likely as part of a fraudulent scheme.

Regarding the current non-use of the disputed domain name, panels have held that passive holding of a domain name (including use of a blank or "coming soon" page) does not, in itself, prevent a finding of bad faith. On the contrary, in assessing the totality of the circumstances of each case, panels have found that registration and non-use of a domain name may still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3). In the present case, having considered the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the Respondent's failure to submit a response, and thus to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or to provide any evidence challenging the Complainant's allegations of bad faith, further supports a finding of bad faith.

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 <oxylabsproxy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/
Reyes Campello Estebaranz
Sole Panelist
Date: April 27, 2026