

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Major League Baseball Properties, Inc. v. Nguyen Van Quang, Nguyen Van Quang

Case No. D2026-1523

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Major League Baseball Properties, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by BMVN International LLC, Viet Nam.

The Respondent is Nguyen Van Quang, Nguyen Van Quang, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mlbkorea-authenticvn.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 10, 2026. On April 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 24, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Anita Gerewal as the sole panelist in this matter on May 26, 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

Major League Baseball (MLB) is a professional baseball organization operating across the United States and Canada, with origins dating back to 1876. MLB currently consists of 30 professional baseball clubs. The Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of Major League Baseball Enterprises, Inc., the commercial arm of MLB. Acting as the exclusive licensing agent, the Complainant administers and grants rights to use the names, logos, trademarks, service marks, trade dress, and other intellectual property owned or controlled by the MLB clubs, the Commissioner's Office, and the Complainant itself in connection with MLB retail products.

"MLB" is a trademark and service mark owned by Major League Baseball and its affiliated entities and may only be used with the permission of MLB or the relevant Major League Baseball entity. The brand is widely recognized as a contemporary fashion label that combines the rich 150-year heritage of Major League Baseball with modern design aesthetics and fashion trends.

The MLB brand commenced operations in Viet Nam in 2019 with the launch of its first store. Distribution of the brand is managed by Maison Retail Management International Joint Stock Company ("Maison"), one of the largest fashion distributors in Viet Nam. Maison acts as a sub-licensee of F&F Co., Ltd., a Korean company that has held a licensing relationship with the Complainant since 1997. As of today, Maison has established a network of 30 MLB stores throughout Viet Nam.

The Complainant owns MLB Trademarks throughout the world in a variety of forms and for a wide range of goods/services in many jurisdictions, including the following registrations in Viet Nam:

- Trademark Registration No. 4-0368939-000 for MLB in international classes 18, 25 and 35, registered on November 5, 2020.
- International registration number 1549904 for MLB in international classes 9, 14, 16, 18, 25, 28, 35 and 41, registered on May 7, 2020, designating, amongst others, Viet Nam.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names incorporating the MLB trademark, including <mlb.com>, which was registered on November 1, 1994.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 21, 2024, and, prior to the filing of the Complaint, resolved to a website offering services directly related to the Complainant's business.

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 Complainant's MLB trademark because it wholly incorporates the MLB mark, which is the first, dominant, and only distinctive element of the disputed domain name. The additional terms "korea," "authentic," and "vn" (a common abbreviation for "Viet Nam"), together with the hyphen and the ".com" gTLD, are descriptive or non-distinctive elements that do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, the inclusion of "vn" reinforces the association with the Complainant, particularly as the corresponding website was presented in Vietnamese and targeted Vietnamese consumers. Accordingly, the disputed domain name creates the false impression of an affiliation with, endorsement by, or connection to the Complainant and its MLB-branded business.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered on November 21, 2024, long after the Complainant had established extensive trademark rights in the MLB mark, which has been widely recognized

worldwide, including in Viet Nam, for many decades. The Respondent has no affiliation, authorization, license, or other relationship with the Complainant and has never been permitted to use the MLB trademark in any manner. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark or other intellectual property rights in the term “MLB” or the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name, without clearly disclosing the absence of any relationship with the Complainant, further demonstrates the lack of any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. Given the longstanding fame and extensive global recognition of the Complainant’s MLB trademark, which predates the registration of the disputed domain name by many decades, the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant’s rights when registering the disputed domain name. By wholly incorporating the MLB trademark and using the disputed domain name to offer MLB-branded products to Vietnamese consumers without authorization, the Respondent intentionally sought to create the false impression of affiliation with, endorsement by, or association with the Complainant. The Respondent reinforced this deception by displaying the Complainant’s trademarks, using copyrighted product images, and reproducing information associated with the Complainant’s authorized distributor. Such conduct was clearly intended to attract Internet users for commercial gain through consumer confusion. Furthermore, the Respondent’s pattern of intermittently activating and deactivating the website during periods of high consumer traffic suggests a deliberate effort to maximize profits while avoiding detection and enforcement, further evidencing bad-faith use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The 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 the MLB trademark 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, “korea”, “authentic” and “vn” together with a hyphen may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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. 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant’s MLB trademark has been used extensively and enjoys substantial recognition worldwide, having been registered and used long before the registration of the disputed domain name. In light of the fame and longstanding reputation of the MLB mark, the Panel considers it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s incorporation of the MLB mark in its entirety supports a finding that the disputed domain name was deliberately selected to target the Complainant and its trademark. The evidence further shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to operate a website offering MLB-branded products to consumers in Viet Nam without the Complainant’s authorization. The website prominently displayed the Complainant’s trademarks, reproduced copyrighted product images, and included information associated with the Complainant’s authorized distributor. Such use was plainly calculated to create a false impression that the website was affiliated with, endorsed by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed copycat sites/ 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 <mlbkorea-authenticvn.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anita Gerewal/

Anita Gerewal

Sole Panelist

Date: June 9, 2026