

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Digital Ventures Malta Limited v. Mark Peter  
Case No. D2026-1769

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Digital Ventures Malta Limited, Malta, represented by BUCKWORTHS Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Mark Peter, India.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <vivastreetindia.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 24, 2026. On April 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 28, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 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 May 1, 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 May 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on June 4, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers, or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is Digital Ventures Malta Limited, a company based in Malta operating an online classified website in multiple jurisdictions, and owning the following trademark registration for VIVASTREET:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003034923 VIVASTREET, registered on April 4, 2014.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its main website being "www.vivastreet.com".

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was registered on March 2, 2026, and it resolves to a website in which escort listing and advertisement services are provided, that is some of the same services as the Complainant.

#### **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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark VIVASTREET.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark VIVASTREET is well-known in the field of classified advertising services. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the

Respondent's website, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") section 4.3.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a 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 disputed 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds 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.

While the addition of other terms, here "india" (the name of the Respondent's purported country), 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 Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is also well-accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".com", is typically disregarded when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The prima facie case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a website in which escort listing and advertisement services are provided, that is some of the same services as the Complainant, thereby taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s reputation and trademark for the Respondent’s commercial benefit.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark VIVASTREET in the field of classified advertising services is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because the disputed domain name resolves to a website in which escort listing and advertisement services are provided, that is some of the same services as the Complainant.

As regards the use in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the disputed domain name’s source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant’s business.

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 above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant’s business, in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, and to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "india" (the name of the Respondent's purported country), further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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, <vivastreetindia.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Edoardo Fano/*

**Edoardo Fano**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 5, 2026