

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Yandex LLC v. Birkan Eken, Platon Bilisim Teknoloji Yazılm
Veri Hizmetleri Anonim irk
Case No. D2026-1308

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Yandex LLC, Russian Federation, represented by Brand Monitor LLC, Russian Federation.

The Respondent is Birkan Eken, Platon Bilisim Teknoloji Yazılm Veri Hizmetleri Anonim irk, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <yazeka.com> 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 26, 2026. On March 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 27, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 30, 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 April 3, 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 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 28, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on April 17, 2026. However, the Respondent did not file any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on April 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki 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 IT company that provides Internet related products and services, which include web browser, search engine, cloud computing, web mapping, online food ordering, streaming media, online-shopping, ride hailing. Per Complaint, the Complainant has been developing services in Türkiye since 2011 with a total audience of over 6 million people. In November 2024, the Complainant announced and on December 18, 2024, released a new product, developed especially for the Turkish market, under the brand name "Yazeka". It is an AI-based Internet-search tool which understands questions asked in Turkish and English and provides answers with integrated visual content. The announcement of the "Yazeka" launch received extensive media coverage. The disputed domain name was registered on December 31, 2024, namely 13 days after the launch of the "Yazeka" product in Turkey.

The Complainant owns the Turkish trademark registration No. 2024 155223, for YAZEKA (figurative), filed on November 22, 2024, and registered on March 21, 2025, for goods and services in international classes 9, 16, 18, 25, 28, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43 and 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 31, 2024, and leads to a GoDaddy parking page that contains a suggestion to contact the domain broker.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On April 17, 2026, the Respondent sent two written communications saying that it does not accept the allegations of the Complainant in the Complaint, however it would be open to a transfer of the disputed domain name under mutually agreed terms. It also stated that it approached the Complainant in order to find an amicable solution to the dispute.

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name the Complainant must prove that:

- (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.

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 generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)).

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 disputed domain name leads to a GoDaddy parking page that contains a suggestion to contact the domain broker with a view to buying the disputed domain name, while there is no reasonable explanation as to the registration and holding of the disputed domain name that could lead the Panel to a conclusion different to the Respondent targeting the Complainant through the disputed domain name, taking also into account the timing of the disputed domain name registration, namely some days after the launch of a new product of the Complainant under an identical to the disputed domain name trademark in the country of the Respondent. The Panel also notes the composition of the disputed domain name which reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety and the fact that the Complainant's mark is a made-up distinctive word.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes a) the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, b) the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the trademark of the Complainant entirely, c) the fact that the disputed domain name was registered under a privacy service, and d) the fact that the disputed domain name registration was made some days after the launch of a new product of the Complainant under an identical name in the country of the Respondent, receiving media coverage.

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 <yazeka.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: May 18, 2026