ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Skyscanner Limited v. WHOIS Privacy Protection Service LLC and Drugs Dsa
Case No. D2026-1276

## 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Skyscanner Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Lewis Silkin LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are WHOIS Privacy Protection Service LLC, United States of America ("United States"), and Drugs Dsa, Brazil.

## 2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <skycannerbr.com>, <skyscamnner.com>, <skyscannenvoos.com>, <skyscannerb.com>, <skyscannerbrasil.com>, <skyscannerbr.com>, <skyscannerpass.com>, <skyscannerpromo.com>, <skyscannersbr.com>, <skyscannervoos.com> and <skyscannerz.com> are registered with Fewmoretaps OU d/b/a Trustname.com. (the "First Registrar").

The disputed domain name <skyscannervos.com> (the "Additional Domain Name") is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Second Registrar")

When all together the disputed domain names are referred herein as the "Domain Names". When together, the First and the Second registrars are referred to as the "Registrars".

## 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 First Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the first 11 disputed domain names. On March 25, 2026, the First Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (not provided) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 26, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the First Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant submitted an email on March 26, 2026, indicating it wished the proceedings to continue without amendment.

The Center verified that 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 27, 2026. On April 7, 2026, the Complainant submitted an amended Complaint to the Center requesting the addition of the <skyscannervos.com> (the "Additional Domain Name") into the dispute. 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 Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on April 21, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

As mentioned above, following the Commencement of Administrative Proceeding, the Complainant requested in a supplemental filing the addition of the Additional Domain Name <skyscannervos.com> to the dispute and submitted an Amended Complaint. On April 22, 2026, per the Panel's instructions, the Center transmitted by email to the Second Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Additional Domain Name. On April 23, 2026, the Second Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. On the same date, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1, inviting the Complainant to submit a second amended Complaint by April 28, 2026, including a request for the Additional Domain Name to be consolidated to the present dispute and to provide relevant arguments or evidence demonstrating that the Domain Names registrants are, in fact, the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control, as well as inviting the Respondents to comment on the Complainant's eventual submission by May 8, 2026. The Complainant submitted a second amended Complaint on April 24, 2026. The Center did not receive any submissions from the Respondents.

## 4. Factual Background

The Complainant operates a travel aggregator platform which offers users comparative pricing from different airlines, online travel agencies, and booking sites to a single platform. The Complainant's website at "www.skyscanner.net" attracts tens of millions of visits per month. To date, its SKYSCANNER app has been downloaded over 70 million times. The Complainant's services are available in over 30 languages and in 70 currencies.

The Complainant owns a global portfolio of registered trademarks for SKYSCANNER, for example International Trademark Registration No. 1030086 (registered on December 1, 2009).

The Domain Names were registered between March 3 and April 1, 2026. The Complainant documents that the Domains Names resolve to webpages that mimic the Complainant's website, including use of the Complainant's images, color scheme, layout, and trademarks.

## 5. Parties' Contentions

### A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that the Domain Names are under common control. All of the Domain Names replicate the Complainant's trademark or misspellings of the Complainant's trademark with some having additional characters or words at the end of the Domain Names. Many of the Domain Names were

registered on the same day or within several days of each other with the same registrar. The Additional Domain Name was registered with a different registrar within days of receipt of the Notification of the Complaint by the Center. All the Domain Names direct to websites that mimic the Complainant's websites. Because of the extreme similarity or identity of the webpages to which all of the Domain Names point, the likelihood of any one of the Domain Names, including the final, being independently created is negligible in the Complainant's view.

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registration and argues, based on former UDRP decisions, that its trademark enjoys global reputation. The Complainant's trademark is immediately identifiable within the Domain Names with minor misspellings and the additional words or letters that would either be overlooked or understood as describing a geographic territory. The Complainant asserts that the Domain Names are highly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. The Respondents do not own trademarks which comprise part or all of the Domain Names. The use of the Domain Names, mimicking the Complainant's websites, is done to lure Internet users to provide personal information, including their name, email address and phone number and purchase travel arrangements that are delivered.

The Complainant argues that at the time of registration of the Domain Names, the Respondents were aware of the Complainant. The Complainant's rights predate the registration of the Domain Names by more than 20 years. Based on the use of the Domain Names, the Complainant argues that the Respondents seek to profit illegitimately by creating a misleading link between the Domain Names and the Complainant's rights. There is no justification for the registration of the Domain Names that replicate the Complainant's well-known trademark and mimic the Complainant's business. Moreover, the Respondents have taken steps to mask their identity through WHOIS privacy service.

**B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1. Procedural Matter – Consolidation

The Complaint was initially filed in relation to domain names registered under a privacy service and the underlying identity for the registrant(s) has not been provided. As for the Additional Domain Name the registrant is named as Drugs Dsa. The Complainant argues that all the Domain Names are in fact registered by the same entity or under common control. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As to the common control, the Panel notes that all the Domain Names direct to a website that mimic the Complainant's website. All Domian Names, except for the Additional Domain Name <skyscannervos.com>, were registered with the same Registrar. The Additional Domain Name was registered with the Second Registrar within days of receipt of the notification of the Complaint by the Center. All of the Domain Names replicate the Complainant's trademark or misspellings of the Complainant's trademark within a similar pattern of misspellings and/or additional characters at the end of the Complainant's trademark.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The registrants have been granted the right to comment but opted not to.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different domain name registrants (referred below to as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

**6.2. Substantive Issues**

**A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark SKYSCANNER. The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trademark, a few of them with misspellings of the letter "n" and "r" with "m" and "n", and/or with the addition of terms such as "br", "brazil", "pass", "z", "voos", "s", "vos", and "promo". The misspellings and additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.9. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.

Based on the available record, 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. While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Names or names corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Respondent's use of the Domain Names to impersonate the Complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests, and is clear evidence of bad faith, see below.

Based on the available record, 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 reputation of the Complainant's trademark, coupled with the composition and use of the Domain Names, establish that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its prior rights when the Respondent registered the Domain Names. The Respondent has used the Domian Names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, which falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Under the circumstances of the case, the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complaint and unmask its identity, further point to bad faith.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The third element of the Policy has been established.

## 7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders the Domain Names <skycannerbr.com>, <skyscamnner.com>, <skyscannenvoos.com>, <skyscannerb.com>, <skyscannerbrasil.com>, <skyscannerbr.com>, <skyscannerpass.com>, <skyscannerpromo.com>, <skyscannersbr.com>, <skyscannervoos.com>, <skyscannerz.com>, and <skyscannervos.com> transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mathias Lilleengen/*
**Mathias Lilleengen**
Sole Panelist
Date: May 15, 2026