

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Radical22 Limited v. company seo, company777
Case No. D2026-1393

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Radical22 Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Stobbs IP Limited, UK.

The Respondent is company seo, company777, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dualipaofficial.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 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 1, 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 April 9, 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 13, 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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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 a private limited company registered in the UK. The Complainant was previously named “Dua Lipa Limited” but changed its name in 2023 to “Radical22 Limited”. It was originally wholly owned by the globally famous singer Dua Lipa, and since 2023, it has been co-owned by Dua Lipa and her father. The Complainant is principally engaged in the promotion and exploitation of various services and productions of the famous singer Dua Lipa. Dua Lipa is a world-renowned singer who is particularly known in the music industry for her globally successful hits that blend pop, dance, and disco influences, and she has also received multiple music awards, including the Grammy and the Brit Awards.

The Complainant asserts that it owns many trademark registrations worldwide for DUA LIPA, including the following:

- the UK trademark registration No. UK00003204883 for DUA LIPA, registered on March 24, 2017; and
- the International trademark registration No. 1527175 for DUA LIPA, registered on October 3, 2019, designating several jurisdictions (including Indonesia, where the Respondent is apparently located).

The Complainant also owns domain names in support of Dua Lipa, including <dualipa.com>, which hosts its official website. The Complainant also engages in a range of promotional activities for Dua Lipa, including the online and physical retail of merchandise, such as concert/tour merchandise. Furthermore, the Complainant operates an online storefront at “www.ukshop.dualipa.com”, whereby it advertises and sells various DUA LIPA-branded goods, including apparel, accessories, and albums.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 2, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is used to redirect Internet users to a live website at “www.inmyopinion.site”, which promotes, advertises, offers for sale and/or sells online gaming and gambling facilities. The Complainant also submits that when using an Indonesian VPN, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name is inactive.

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 confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has prior rights; the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "official", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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. Firstly, the Panel notes the Complainant's assertions that the Respondent is not licensed by the Complainant to use its trademark in any manner, and that the Respondent, the disputed domain name, and the website to which the disputed domain name was previously redirected are not affiliated with the Complainant or Dua Lipa in any way. Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name suggests that there is an affiliation with the Complainant when in fact there is not one. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Lastly, the Panel considers the Complainant's unrebutted evidence that the disputed domain name was previously used to redirect Internet users to a website that promotes online gaming and gambling. In the Panel's view, such use establishes that the Respondent acted with the intention to mislead Internet users and take unfair advantage of the Complainant's well-known trademark for its commercial gain. This use cannot give rights or legitimate interests in a domain name under the Policy. The current inactive use of the disputed domain name does not alter the Panel's determination under the second element.

By failing to submit a Response, 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.

Accordingly, 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

First, Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Second, the Panel also considers the registration dates of the Complainant's trademarks and the disputed domain name; the well-known nature of the DUA LIPA trademark; and the composition and previous use of the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the DUA LIPA trademark.

Third, considering the un rebutted evidence regarding the previous use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the DUA LIPA trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. Such use is also considered detrimental to the Complainant's trademark and constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Lastly, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is currently inactive. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. In this regard, the Panel, first, notes the reputation of the DUA LIPA trademark. Second, the Panel considers the composition of the disputed domain name, which fully incorporates the DUA LIPA trademark with the addition of the term "official", and finds that there is no plausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. In the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 <dualipaofficial.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu/

Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu

Sole Panelist

Date: May 29, 2026