ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Ooredoo IP LLC v. Carolina Lane
Case No. D2026-1853

## 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ooredoo IP LLC, Qatar, represented by Abu-Ghazaleh Intellectual Property (AGIP), Egypt.

The Respondent is Carolina Lane, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

## 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ooredooconnect.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 30, 2026. On April 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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 Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 4, 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 6, 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 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Martin Michaus Romero 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.

## 4. Factual Background

The Complainant states:

1.- It is a wholly owned subsidiary of Ooredoo QPSC (formerly Qtel) an international telecommunications company headquartered in Doha, Qatar.

2.- Was founded in Doha in 1987 initially as a telephone exchange company. It has since grown to become the largest communications operator in Qatar offering new technologies to the country including mobile, broadband, digital, and fiber services. The publicly-traded company has ownership from the royal family.

3.- Qtel Group and all its operating companies worldwide were officially unified under Ooredoo Group in February 2013, as part of the company's strategy to combine its assets in order to form a global business within the telecommunications industry.

4.- The name Ooredoo was chosen to reflect the aspirations of the Complainant group's customers and the core belief that the Complainant's group can enrich people's lives and stimulate human growth in the communities where it operates.

5.- It has experienced significant growth, transforming from a single market operator in Qatar to an international communications company with a global customer base of more than 114 million customers worldwide as of September 2015.

6.- The Complainant provides mobile, wireless, wireline, and content services with market share in domestic and international telecommunications markets and in business (corporations and individuals) and residential markets.

7.- It was the first operator globally to launch commercial 5G services in Qatar and is one of the world´s largest mobile telecommunications companies, with over 115 million customers worldwide as of 2018.

8.- It operates in nine markets across the Middle East, North Africa, and Southeast Asia, it serves nearly 150 million customers enabling digital transformation at scale. As of December 2025, it generated full-year revenue of QAR 24.6 billion. Its shares are listed on the Qatar Stock Exchange and the Abu Dhabi Securities Exchange.

9.- It owns several trademarks registrations for OOREDOO in different jurisdictions, including European Union Trademark No. 012154795 registered on March 5, 2014, in international classes 7, 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 41.

10.- It owns the registered domain name <ooredoo.com> since October 18,2009; <ooredoo.qa> and <ooredoo.om>, which are connected to websites incorporating its OOREDOO trademark and reflect its scope of business.

11.- "Oredoo" is derived from the company name "Oredoo IP LLC", and is also used on social media platforms including You Tube, Facebook, Twitter & LinkedIn.

12.- The disputed domain name <ooredooconnect.com>, was registered on December 8, 2025, and resolves to an inactive website.

**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.

Complainant contends that:

1.- "Ooredoo" is a key part of the Complainant's corporate entity and is prominently featured in all public-facing operations.

2.- The disputed domain name <ooredooconnect.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant´s OOREDOO trademarks as it incorporates such mark in its entirety, and the term "connect" does not sufficiently distinguish the domain name from the trademark.

3.- The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way and has not been authorized by the Complainant to register and use any domain name incorporating the trademark OOREDOO for its own purposes.

4.- There is no business or legal relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Respondent has no prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

5.- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name anonymously and hence, cannot claim to have been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

6.- By registering the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent intended to create a connection to the Complainant and to take unfair advantage of its OOREDOO trademark and hence mislead users into believing that the domain name is related to the Complainant.

7.- There is no question that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant, its mark and the Complainant´s exclusive rights in that mark, and the reputation of that mark when it registered the domain name.

**B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

**6. Discussion and Findings**

Under the Policy, the complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

(ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in 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 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 mark is recognizable 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.

The addition of the term "connect" after the trademark OOREDOO does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.9 and 1.11.

Considering that the disputed domain name <ooredooconnect.com>, reproduces the trademark OOREDOO in its entirety, 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 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 with 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.

The Respondent has neither used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services nor for a legitimate noncommercial or fair purpose. The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's coined OOREDOO trademark and a term associated with its business carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1. As such, in the Panel's view, the disputed domain name was created with the intention to mislead Inernet users into believing that there is a connection or association with the Complainant.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established

**C. Registered and Used 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 record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the Panel notes that:

A) The Respondent should have been aware of the existence of the Complainant and its activities and business operations under the OOREDOO trademark, at the international level, at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

B) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's OOREDOO trademark.

C) The Complainant's OREDOO trademark and domain names predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

D) The Complainant has not granted an authorization, consent or license to the Respondent to use the OOREDOO mark, as part of the disputed domain name.

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, panelists 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. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the absence of a response, and finds that 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.

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 <ooredooconnect.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Martin Michaus Romero/*
**Martin Michaus Romero**
Sole Panelist
Date: June 16, 2026