

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WINGSTOP FRANCHISING, LLC. v. Sufyan Abu
Case No. D2026-1460

1. The Parties

The Complainant is WINGSTOP FRANCHISING, LLC., United States of America ("US").

The Respondent is Sufyan Abu, United Kingdom ("UK").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wingstopmenu.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with IONOS SE (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 (Redacted for Privacy / Sufyan Abu) 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 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Michal Havlík 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 US franchisor of restaurants focusing on buffalo-style chicken wings and other chicken products together with complementary side items, which operates extensively through numerous restaurants around the world. The Complainant has owned and operated its website at the domain name <wingstop.com> since March 1, 1997, where Internet users can find various information about the Complainant and its business.

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations among others including:

- US trademark registration No. 3054484 for WINGSTOP with registration date January 31, 2006;
- UK trademark registration No. UK00801108677 for WINGSTOP with registration date January 17, 2013.

(the “WINGSTOP marks”).

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 17, 2025. At the date of this decision, the website placed under the Disputed Domain Name contains only the information that “This Account has been suspended”. Nevertheless, the Disputed Domain Name used to resolve to a website that looked similar to the Complainant’s official website in the past.

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.

The Complainant cites its US trademarks incorporating the sign WINGSTOP or WING-STOP and refers to its other trademarks registered in other jurisdictions. The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the WINGSTOP marks since it nearly fully incorporates the WINGSTOP marks. According to the Complainant, the addition of a word “menu” exacerbates the likelihood of confusion between the Disputed Domain Name and WINGSTOP marks because the descriptive term “menu” references Complainant’s menu and restaurant services. According to the Complainant, the addition of the word “menu” only adds to the confusion in the mind of Internet users as to whether the Disputed Domain Name is associated with the Complainant.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interest in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. Firstly, the Complainant holds that the Respondent was undoubtedly familiar with the WINGSTOP marks at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the Respondent claims that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website with information about Wingstop and its services and the website appears to visitors as though it is Complainant’s website. Moreover, the Complainant claims that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant further states that the website at the Disputed Domain Name is made to look like a Complainant domain name, showing (a) that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Disputed Domain Name was registered, and (b) that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

- (i) that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a service mark in which the Complainant has right; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights regarding a trademark or service mark for the purpose of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The threshold requirement of confusing similarity under the first element is met where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the term "wingtop", which shares seven letters with the WINGSTOP marks, including an identical first four letters, rendering the WINGSTOP marks clearly recognizable therein. As to the addition of the term "menu", the addition of other terms to a trademark in a domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, this Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the WINGSTOP marks in which the Complainant has rights.

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, previous panels have recognized that proving a respondent lack of 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 right 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 (even though 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 Complainant has proved that the Disputed Domain Name used to resolve to a website with information about the Complainant that looked like being the Complainant's official website. Such use of the Disputed Domain Name cannot constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name or its use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Furthermore, the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name nor does the Respondent have any license or permission to use the WINGSTOP marks.

The Respondent has not responded to the Complainant's contentions and the Respondent has thus not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence illustrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 purpose of paragraph 4(a)(iii), paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, 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.

The Panel notes that the WINGSTOP marks predate registration date of the Disputed Domain Name by several years. The fact that the Disputed Domain Name contains the term "menu" that is characteristic for the restaurant services in combination with the fact that the website placed under the Disputed Domain Name used to look like being operated by the Complainant shows that that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant at the time of the registration of the Disputed Domain Name and the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and the WINGSTOP marks. Such circumstances shows that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

In the light of the above-mentioned, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

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 <wingtopmenu.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Michal Havlík/

Michal Havlík

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026