

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Kiano Reves

Case No. D2026-1387

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL c/o Walters Law Group, United States of America.

The Respondent is Kiano Reves, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <megaupersonals.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 1, 2026. On April 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 4, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 7, 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 April 7, 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 April 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Torsten Bettinger as the sole panelist in this matter on May 15, 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 the owner and operator of online personal and social introduction services offered under the MEGAPERSONALS mark.

The Complainant owns United States Trademark Registration No. 6432591 for the word mark MEGAPERSONALS in International Class 45, registered on July 27, 2021.

The Complainant registered the domain name <megapersonals.com> on June 12, 2003. The Complainant has used the <megapersonals.com> domain name in connection with its services since at least as early as March 30, 2004.

The disputed domain name <megaupersonals.com> was registered on December 7, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website which, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, mimics the appearance of the Complainant's website and offers services similar to or competing with those offered by the Complainant.

The website at the disputed domain name also reproduces a logo identical or highly similar to the Complainant's logo.

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.

With regard to the requirement of identity or confusing similarity between the trademark and the domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant contends that:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS trademark;
- the disputed domain name contains the Complainant's mark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the letter "u" between the terms "mega" and "personals";
- such addition constitutes a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark and is a typical case of typosquatting; and
- the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

With regard to the Respondent having no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant submits that:

- the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant;
- the Respondent has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the MEGAPERSONALS mark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and does not hold any trademark rights in the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website which mimics the appearance of the Complainant's website;
- the website at the disputed domain name contains a logo identical or highly similar to the Complainant's logo; and
- such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, with regard to the disputed domain name having been registered and being used in bad faith, the Complainant argues that:

- the disputed domain name was registered after the Complainant had acquired registered and common law rights in the MEGAPERSONALS mark;
- the Respondent registered a typosquatted version of the Complainant's mark by inserting the letter "u" into the mark;
- the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to operate a website offering services in direct competition with the Complainant;
- the Respondent's website mimics the appearance of the Complainant's website and uses an identical or highly similar logo; and
- the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

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, Third Edition, "[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)", section 1.7.

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

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark in its entirety, with the addition of the letter "u" between "mega" and "personals". The Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The addition of a single letter does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. In the present case, the insertion of the letter "u" appears to be a minor misspelling of the Complainant's trademark and is characteristic of typosquatting. Such an alteration does not dispel the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity analysis.

Accordingly, 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 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its MEGAPERSONALS trademark. There is no evidence on the record that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name consists of a typographical variation of the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark. The nature of the disputed domain name carries a clear risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and suggests that the Respondent sought to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's mark. The Panel finds that subtle misspellings of a complainant's mark in a domain name can also impersonate the complainant, as there is a risk that Internet users will not notice the difference between the misspelling and the complainant's mark. See *Banque et Caisse d'Epargne de l'Etat, Luxembourg, v. Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc / hans larsson*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1505](#).

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website which mimics the appearance of the Complainant's website and offers services similar to or competing with those of the Complainant. The website also uses a logo identical or highly similar to the Complainant's logo. Such use is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and the corresponding website are operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainant.

Such conduct cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Nor does the Panel find any evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

On the contrary, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name appears intended to create a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant for commercial gain.

The Respondent has not submitted any response and has not come forward with any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name <megaupersonals.com> within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

Bad faith registration

In the present case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <megaupersonals.com> was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 7, 2025, after the Complainant had acquired registered rights in the MEGAPERSONALS mark and long after the Complainant began using the <megapersonals.com> domain name in connection with its services.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark with the mere addition of the letter "u". This addition does not create any independent meaning and is characteristic of typosquatting.

The Panel considers it highly unlikely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name independently or without knowledge of the Complainant and its mark.

The Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant is further confirmed by the use of the disputed domain name for a website which mimics the Complainant's website and uses a logo identical or highly similar to the Complainant's logo.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its MEGAPERSONALS mark in mind.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Bad faith use

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name has been used to resolve to a website which mimics the appearance of the Complainant's website and offers services similar to or competing with those provided by the Complainant.

The use of a disputed domain name that is a typosquatted version of the Complainant's mark, together with a copycat website and a logo identical or highly similar to the Complainant's logo, is calculated to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant.

In the Panel's view, this conduct constitutes an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not filed any response and has not provided any plausible explanation for its registration or use of the disputed domain name. In the circumstances of this case, the absence of any such explanation further supports a finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <megaupersonals.com> has been registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <megaupersonals.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Torsten Bettinger/

Torsten Bettinger

Sole Panelist

Date: May 29, 2026