ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
E-Movers LLC v. E Move UAE
Case No. D2026-1453

1. The Parties

The Complainant is E-Movers LLC, United Arab Emirates, represented internally.

The Respondent is E Move UAE, United Arab Emirates, represented internally.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <emoveuae.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 6, 2026. On April 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 8, 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 (Unknown / Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 10, 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 Response was filed with the Center on May 4, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on April 10, 2026. The Complainant and the Respondent submitted Supplemental Filings to the Center on May 8, 2026 and May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 moving company based in Dubai, United Arab Emirates and owns United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration No. 200248, registered on October 1, 2014 for E-MOVERS. The Complainant offers its services through the domain name <emoversuae.com>

The disputed domain name was registered on September 21, 2025, and resolves to a website that offers moving services.

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 a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name incorporates the dominant part of the Complainant's trademark "emove" and has added to it the letters "uae", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. This is a case of typosquatting.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the Complainant's trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "Emove UAE". The Respondent is not using the domain for a legitimate or fair purpose. Instead, the Respondent is using the domain to host a website that mimics the Complainant's business model and steals its advertising copy to divert customers.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has been operating for over 20 years in the Dubai market and has won accreditations. The Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. The Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Respondent is actively disrupting the Complainant's business.

B. Respondent

The Respondent submits that it is licensed to conduct moving activities in Dubai, United Arab Emirates and the disputed domain name reflects its tradename and is used in good faith in connection with legitimate commercial activities.

The Respondent submits that its trade name is Ehome Emover Cargo Packaging and that "EMOVER" is a distinctive part of its license and that its brand is "E Move UAE". The similarities with the Complainant's trademark arise from the fact that "mover/movers" are common descriptive words in the moving industry.

The Respondent submits that it has legitimate rights and interests in the disputed domain name as he has been using it for a bona fide offering of moving services and the Respondent is commonly known by "E Move UAE".

The Respondent submits that there has been no bad faith registration or use as it never contacted the Complainant to offer the disputed domain name for sale. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name to disrupt the business of a competitor and is not attempting to create confusion with the Complainant. There are no advertisements that use any confusing terms. Previously, this occurred as a result of standard keyword insertion tools.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Procedural Issues

A. Addition of a Domain name

The Complainant requested the addition of a domain name subsequent to notification of the Complaint to the Respondent and after the commencement of the proceedings. The Panel is guided by paragraph 4.12.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.1. The Panel is of the view that adding another domain name would delay the proceedings and that the Complainant's right to file separate proceedings remain unaffected. Therefore, the Panel rejects the request to add another domain name to the current proceeding.

B. Supplemental Filing

The Panel has reviewed but finds the supplemental filings unnecessary as the Complaint and the Response are sufficient in assisting the Panel reach a determination on this matter. Therefore, the Panel has not considered the supplemental filings filed by the Parties. In any event, the Panel notes that the supplemental filings would not have changed the outcome of this proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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.

A typo variant of the mark (where the mark remains sufficiently recognizable) 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, sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "uae", 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.

The Panel finds it necessary to consider two grounds that may grant the Respondent rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. First, the disputed domain name is being used to offer moving services, which itself may be a legitimate business. But the Panel is of the view that the disputed domain name was chosen with the intention of confusing Internet users into believing that it is associated with the Complainant and as such this is not a bona fide offering in terms of the Policy. Further analysis on this point is provided under the third element. Second, the Respondent submits that its trade name is “Ehome Emover Cargo Packaging” and argues that the disputed domain name reflects its tradename. However, this argument is unconvincing. The Respondent has left out three words out of four which constitute its tradename, added the letters “uae” and deleted the letter “r” from the word “Emover”. As a result, the disputed domain name hardly resembles the Respondent’s tradename. The Respondent also argues that it is commonly known by “E Move UAE” but does not submit evidence on this point. Therefore, the Panel finds insufficient evidence in the record to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant’s business and trademark as the Respondent operates in the field of moving, i.e., the same field as the Complainant, and in the same country. Additionally, the disputed domain name was registered more than a decade after the registration of the Complainant’s trademark. Also, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves displays a character on top that is similar in color and concept to the characters displayed on the Complainant’s website. Further, the Respondent’s website uses the color red in a shade identical to the Complainant’s website. Therefore, it is the Panel’s view that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name contains the letters “uae”, which replicate the use of these letters in the Complainant’s domain name.

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 held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed, passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <emoveuae.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/
Nayiri Boghossian
Sole Panelist
Date: May 15, 2026