

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

### **Uber Technologies, Inc. v. Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC Case No. D2026-1270**

#### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Uber Technologies, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

Respondent is Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC, United States, represented by Brian H. Leventhal, Attorney at Law, P.C., United States.

#### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <uberforbusiness.com> (the “Domain Name”) 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 25, 2026. On March 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 25, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the 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 Complainant on March 26, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 28, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 20, 2026. Respondent, through its representative, sent an email communication to the Center on April 20, 2026, requesting an automatic four-day extension to file a response. On April 21, 2026, the Center confirmed that Respondent had been granted the automatic four calendar day extension under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. Respondent did not submit any formal Response. On April 29, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on May 1, 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**

Complainant is a global technology company that uses a network to facilitate transporting people and things, including connecting consumers with independent drivers for ridesharing services, and consumers with restaurants, grocers and other stores with service providers for meal preparation, grocery and other delivery services. As of December 31, 2024, Complainant and its subsidiaries had approximately 31,000 employees globally and operations in over 15,000 cities around the world. As of the year ending December 31, 2024, Complainant had 171 million monthly active platform consumers with a revenue of USD 43.978 billion.

Since around July 2014, Complainant has offered a service called "Uber for Business," which makes it easier for companies to manage rides and meal deliveries. Complainant's Uber for Business service allows organizations to create custom travel and meal programs, manage spending and enable their teams to use the Uber and Uber Eats apps. Complainant's Uber for Business service is used by over 200,000 companies worldwide.

Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks worldwide, with the UBER mark, including:

- United States registered trademark number 3,977,893 for the UBER word mark, registered June 14, 2011; and
- International registered trademark number 1,111,203 for the UBER word mark, registered on December 13, 2011.

Complainant also owns registered trademarks for the UBER FOR BUSINESS mark, including:

- United States registered trademark number 6,852,956 for UBER FOR BUSINESS word mark, first used in commerce July 2014; registered September 20, 2022;
- European Union registered trademark number 018316988 for UBER FOR BUSINESS word mark, registered January 6, 2023; and
- Australian registered trademark number 2125908 for UBER FOR BUSINESS word mark, registered February 1, 2022.

Complainant also owns and operates numerous domain names, including <uber.com>, which was created on July 14, 1995 and acquired by Complainant around January 4, 2011 and which it uses in connection with its primary website.

The Domain Name was registered on December 26, 2015, and redirects to a website that offers it for sale for USD 24,888.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for UBER and UBER FOR BUSINESS and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known UBER and UBER FOR BUSINESS products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes Complainant's trademarks, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

Complainant further asserts that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct because Respondent has lost multiple proceedings under the Policy including *Facebook, Inc. v. Domain Asset Holdings*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-0516](#).

Accordingly, Complainant requests transfer of the Domain Name to Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant's contentions. However, Respondent's representative sent an email to the Center and Complainant's representative on April 20, 2026, indicating that Respondent was being represented and requested for four additional days to respond to the Complaint pursuant to paragraph 5(b) of the Rules.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") states that failure to respond to a complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to formally respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

### **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 Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy namely, the UBER and UBER FOR BUSINESS trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel further finds that Complainant's UBER and UBER FOR BUSINESS trademarks are clearly recognizable within the Domain Name. With regards to the UBER trademark, the addition of the term "for

business” after the UBER trademark in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and Complainant’s UBER trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8. With regards to the UBER FOR BUSINESS trademark, the Domain Name is identical to this trademark.

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 proceedings under the Policy 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.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was likely aware of Complainant and its UBER and UBER FOR BUSINESS trademarks when registering the Domain Name. In addition, Complainant asserts that it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized Respondent to register or use the UBER and UBER FOR BUSINESS trademarks in any manner, and Respondent is not related to Complainant. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the UBER or UBER FOR BUSINESS trademark and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

Furthermore, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name redirected to a webpage that offered the Domain Name for sale at USD 24,888. Such use, in the circumstances of this case, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and cannot confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Moreover, the nature of the Domain Name, including Complainant’s UBER and UBER FOR BUSINESS trademarks, has reinforced its association with Complainant’s business, which is inherently misleading and carries a risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided evidence to show that registration and use of the UBER trademark long predates the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known. In addition, the addition of the term “for business” to Complainant’s UBER trademark in the Domain

Name implies affiliation to Complainant's business activities because Complainant has offered a service called "Uber for Business" since around July 2014. Therefore, Respondent was likely aware of the UBER trademark and Complainant's "Uber for Business" service when it registered the Domain Name. The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith.

The Panel also finds bad faith use based on the fame and distinctiveness of Complainant's trademarks and Respondent's offering of the Domain Name for sale at USD 24,888. The Panel considers that the price indicated for the Domain Name, likely in excess of out-of-pocket costs, derives from its significance in connection with the UBER and UBER FOR BUSINESS trademarks, which constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.1.

The Panel further notes that Respondent has been involved in prior UDRP cases in which Respondent was found to have registered and used the domain names in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <uberforbusiness.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Kimberley Chen Nobles/*

**Kimberley Chen Nobles**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 6, 2026