

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Udemy, Inc. v. jun yin  
Case No. D2026-1162

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Udemy, Inc., United States of America, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is jun yin, China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <udemy.cam> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 18, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 21, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 27, 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 30, 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 April 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on May 4, 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 online course and e-learning platform based in the United States of America. The Complainant was founded in 2010 and provides its services in numerous countries.

The Complainant owns the following UDEMY trade marks:

- United States of America (“US”) trade mark UDEMY number 4314406 registered on April 2, 2013;
- European Union trade mark UDEMY number 011006319 registered on November 28, 2012; and
- Australian trade mark UDEMY number 1704475 registered from July 21, 2014.

The Complainant operates its website at the domain name <udemy.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on February 6, 2026. The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name was offered for sale for GBP 375.60 (Annex 11 to the Complaint). At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage offering the disputed domain name for sale for EUR 430.20.

The Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent on February 10, 2026. The Complainant did not receive any response.

The Respondent is apparently located in China.

#### **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 its UDEMY trade marks.

The Complainant states that to the best of its knowledge, the Respondent does not own any rights in the disputed domain name and the Respondent is not known nor has it ever been known by the term “udemy”. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services given that it redirects Internet users to a website where the disputed domain name is offered for sale. The Complainant also highlights the fact that there is a high risk of implied affiliation between the disputed domain name and the Complainant given that the disputed domain name is identical to the UDEMY trade mark at the second level and the Top Level Domain (“TLD”) itself (“.cam”) is highly similar to the TLD “.com” which is the one used for the Complainant’s main website at “www.udemy.com”.

The Complainant points to the goodwill acquired by the UDEMY trade mark over the years and the fact that all top results obtained in a Google search for “udemy” relate to the Complainant, to conclude that the identical reproduction of the UDEMY trade mark in the disputed domain name must have been made in an effort to target the Respondent. In terms of use in bad faith, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trade mark or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

## **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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the UDEMY trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the trade 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 as the disputed domain name is identical to the UDEMY trade mark, it intrinsically carries a high risk of implied affiliation. The risk of implied affiliation is made greater by the use of the TLD ".cam" which is very similar to the TLD ".com" which is the one used for the Complainant's main website at "www.udemy.com". [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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 disputed domain name reproduces the exact UDEMY trade mark of the Complainant and this is unlikely to be a coincidence given the overall circumstances of the present case including (i) the fact that the disputed domain name was registered relatively recently and many years after the registration of the trade mark UDEMY, (ii) the online visibility of the Complainant's UDEMY trade mark and strong association between the term "udemy" and the Complainant as shown by the results of a Google search for the term "udemy" and (iii) the fact that the disputed domain name is identical to the UDEMY trade mark.

The Panel thus finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

In terms of use in bad faith, the Panel notes that after the cease and desist letter sent by the Complainant to the Respondent, the disputed domain name has been offered for sale via the Registrar website. Given (i) that the term "udemy" is a fanciful term and (ii) the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, the Panel considers that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily to sell it for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs (absent any evidence from the Respondent to the contrary) and this is evidence of bad faith behavior in the circumstances of this case, as per paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

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 <udemy.cam> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Vincent Denoyelle/*

**Vincent Denoyelle**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 18, 2026