

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Microsoft Corporation v. igor milanovic
Case No. D2026-1942

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Microsoft Corporation, United States of America (the “United States”), represented by Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is igor milanovic, Serbia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <microsoftsoftwares.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 May 5, 2026. On May 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 6, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 8, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 13, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 7, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 8, 2026, requesting automatic (4) calendar days extension to file the Response. The new due date for Response was June 11, 2026. The Respondent did not file any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on June 23, 2026. However, due to

cyberflight tactics apparently being deployed by the Respondent, the case and the appointment of the Panel were delayed.¹

In fact, it appears that the Respondent, profiting from a technical mistake on the part of the Registrar which did not promptly lock the disputed domain name, transferred the disputed domain name to a third party in the course of the present proceeding. However, thanks to the Center's intervention and the co-operation of the Registrars involved, the disputed domain name was transferred back to the original Respondent in compliance with the UDRP Rules.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on July 17, 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 leading developer and provider of personal-computer (PC) software systems and applications, cloud computing services, video games and other online services, with global operations through its subsidiaries, affiliates and/or licensees.

The Complainant has established Internet websites located at domain names comprising the MICROSOFT name and trademark, including <microsoft.com> and <microsoft.net>.

The Complainant has become one of the largest information technology companies in the world. As of June 30, 2025, it has subsidiaries in over 120 countries worldwide with an employee headcount of 125,000 in the United States and a further 103,000 internationally, for a total of 228,000 worldwide.

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks corresponding and/or including the MICROSOFT sign.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

International Trademark Registration MICROSOFT (word) No. 1318242 registered on May 27, 2016;

United States Trademark Registration MICROSOFT (word) No. 1256083 registered on November 1, 1983; and

European Union Trade Mark MICROSOFT (word) No. 000330910 registered on May 7, 1999.

Previous UDRP Panels have recognized that the MICROSOFT trademark is world famous and well-known.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 6, 2018, and resolves to a website where the MICROSOFT trademark is displayed at the top of the website, purported MICROSOFT-branded goods are offered for sale, and the provider of the website is indicated as Microsoft Softwares LLC.

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.

¹Cyberflight is the term used to describe an attempt to avoid or delay judicial or UDRP proceedings by changing domain registration details or registrars after learning of a complaint.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the addition of the term “softwares” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant’s MICROSOFT trademark, which remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. In addition, the Complainant affirms that the Respondent is clearly purporting to be an official and authorised online retailer of the Complainant’s MICROSOFT products, by using the Complainant’s MICROSOFT trademark in the disputed domain name together with the non-distinctive and descriptive term “softwares” (sic). The Complainant thus claims that such use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also claims that, given the fame of the MICROSOFT trademark, it may be inferred that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark and did so in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not send a formal response to the Complainant’s contentions. In fact, the Respondent sent only an email communication to the Center on June 8, 2026, requesting an extension to file a Response, which it then failed to file.

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced and 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, “softwares”, 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.

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 illegal activity here, claimed as 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant’s trademark registrations and rights to the MICROSOFT trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant’s trademark was registered. In addition, owing to the substantial presence established worldwide and on the Internet by the Complainant, and considering the composition of the disputed domain name, it is at the least very unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the existence of the Complainant, or of the Complainant’s trademarks, when registering the disputed domain name.

Prior UDRP panels have repeatedly recognized the strength and renown of the Complainant’s MICROSOFT trademark. In fact, “MICROSOFT” is not a common or descriptive term, but one of the most renowned trademarks in the world.

Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, had knowledge of the Complainant’s earlier rights to the MICROSOFT trademark.

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.

On the Respondent’s website, explicit references to the Complainant’s products, which are offered at discounted prices, and the Complainant’s MICROSOFT trademark are displayed. It appears that the Respondent’s intention is to pass itself off as the Complainant and/or as an authorized online distributor/retailer of the Complainant’s MICROSOFT products, and this amounts to bad faith use of the disputed domain name.

In addition, from the submission provided by the Complainant, it appears that numerous Internet users that purchased alleged MICROSOFT-branded goods through the Respondent's website complained of being defrauded by the Respondent, specifically indicating, inter alia, that the goods were not functional and/or not original, that their customer service requests went unanswered, and that the website was bogus.

The bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name are also affirmed by the fact that the Respondent did not respond to nor has denied the assertions of bad faith made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed as 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 <microsoftsoftwares.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: July 21, 2026