

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Travelscape, LLC v. jun yin
Case No. D2026-1951

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Travelscape, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP, United States.

The Respondent is jun yin, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <travelocity.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (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 (Redacted for Privacy / Super Privacy Service Ltd C/O Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 11, 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 15, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

the due date for Response was June 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Harini Narayanswamy as the sole panellist in this matter on June 12, 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 in the business of providing online travel related services. Expedia is the owner of the Complainant and acquired the Complainant's predecessor-in-interest in January 2015. The Travelocity website was launched in 1996 and operates from the domain name <travelocity.com>.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the TRAVELOCITY mark in the United States and in other jurisdictions including Hong Kong, China, Australia, Canada, and Mexico. Some of its trademark registrations are:

United States trademark registration No. 2466132 for TRAVELOCITY (word mark), filed on September 29, 1998, registered on July 3, 2001 under international classes 35, 38, 39, and 42.

European Union trademark registration No. 000163642 for TRAVELOCITY (word mark), filed on April 1, 1996, registered on September 14, 2001 under international classes 9 and 39.

Hong Kong (SAR), China trademark registration No. 2002B15646AA for TRAVELOCITY (word mark) , filed on June 14, 2000 registered on December 6, 2002 under international classes 39 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 11, 2025.

At the time of filing the present Complaint, the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's website. The Complainant has submitted evidence that shows the Respondent has arranged for the disputed domain name to go through an advertising network before reaching the Complainant's 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.

The Complainant states that the TRAVELOCITY mark and its star design logo has been used extensively for over 25 years. Its website on average receives over five million visits per month since November 2024 and is ranked 1,586th in terms of websites visited in the United States, and is ranked 75th in the tourism and travel category.

The Complainant contends that it is known to travellers worldwide, has hundreds of employees, and has a strong social media presence. The Complainant states that it has received several awards, including "World's Leading Travel Internet Site" for nine consecutive years (1997 – 2006), "World's Leading Online Travel Agency" (2013-2022), "World's Leading Travel Booking Website" (2008-2012) and the United States' Leading Online Travel Agency (2021-2024). Further, the EXPEDIA trademark has been recognized as a "well publicized Internet travel company" in *Expedia, Inc. v. Alvaro Colloza*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0716](#).

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name which incorporates the TRAVELOCITY trademark in its entirety is confusingly similar to the mark. Further, the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) “.cam”, is a standard registration requirement which is generally disregarded and does not change the confusing similarity with the mark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain. The Complainant states it has prior rights in the TRAVELOCITY mark and the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, the registration records show the name is “jun yin”. No license or permission has been given to the Respondent to use its mark and no relationship exist between the parties.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is not used for bona fide, legitimate or non-commercial fair use, but misleads Internet users and the Respondent attempts to derive unfair gains. The Complainant contends that the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name in his own name fails to create rights or legitimate interests as the Complainant has no control over it.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant further states that the disputed domain name which redirects users to the Complainant’s website, shows the Respondent’s knowledge of the Complainant mark and there is evidence to show the disputed domain name has been linked with advertisement networks.

The Complainant asserts that the evidence of the Respondent’s pattern of registration of domain names containing well-known marks are seven other prior UDRP decisions, which include : *Pixabay GmbH v. jun yin*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4253](#); *Boursorama S.A v. Jun Yin*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2019-0043](#); *Adobe Inc., v Jun Yin*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0027](#), where domain names registered by the Respondent, were transferred to the trademark owners. The Complainant requests for transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Three elements that need to be established by the Complainant, in order to obtain the remedy of transfer of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy are:

- (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 lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

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 filed evidence of its ownership for the TRAVELOCITY marks. 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 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 gTLD “. cam” is a standard or functional requirement of a domain name and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy sets forth the following circumstances where a respondent may have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

- (i) Before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, the use by the respondent of demonstrable preparations to use the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or
- (ii) The respondent, as an individual, business or other organization has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trade mark or service mark rights or
- (iii) The respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the evidence on record does not show that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or a business name that corresponds to the disputed domain name. Further, the material on record does not indicate that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is obviously aware of the Complainant’s rights in the TRAVELOCITY trademark and does not have any authorization or license to use the mark. The Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s well-known mark in the disputed domain name creates an implied affiliation with the mark which is likely to mislead Internet users as to source, origin or affiliation of the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for legitimate non-commercial or fair use. On the contrary, evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to divert Internet users to the Complainant’s own website and attempts to derive benefit from online advertisement networks, which does not constitute a basis for rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

It has been consistently found in previous cases that use of a disputed domain name for redirecting Internet users to the Complainant’s own site would not confer rights or legitimate interests. See for instance, *Proctor.io Incorporated v. Jake Miller, OutboundView*, WIPO Case No. 2026-1151.

The Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in and around December 2025, which is much after the Complainant’s established rights in the trademark. These facts taken together, are sufficient to establish a

prima facie case under the Policy that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds, for all the reasons discussed, that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 from the material on record that:

First, the Complainant has established that the TRAVELOCITY mark is a reputed mark that has been extensively used by the Complainant prior to the registration of the disputed domain name and prior to the Respondent's acquisition of the disputed domain name. The term "Travelocity" has no dictionary meaning, except as a source identifier referring to the Complainant's mark and business. Given the reputation and fame of the Complainant's mark, the disputed domain name would misrepresent to a typical Internet user that any website that is operated using the disputed domain name is either associated or endorsed by the trademark owner or its authorized licensees.

Second, the Respondent has redirected the disputed domain name to the Complainant's site, which as submitted by the Complainant, clearly discloses the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant's mark. The most plausible inference that can be drawn from the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name under the discussed circumstances, is that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademark in mind.

It is well established, that the registration of a domain name with a complainant's trademark in mind, and targets the trademark is bad faith registration of the disputed domain name. See *Baccarat SA v. MSL International, Inc.* WIPO Case No. [D2005-0048](#). Under the discussed facts and circumstances in the present case, the Panel finds the registration of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith registration under the Policy.

Third, the respondent has the control over the redirection of the disputed domain name which creates an implied or ongoing threat to the complainant and constitutes bad faith use of the disputed domain name. See *Proctor.io Incorporated v. Jake Miller, OutboundView*, supra.

Fourth, the use of a disputed domain name incorporating a trademark by an unauthorized party to redirect Internet users to a complainant's website or to other sites is strong evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4 (b)(iv) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel finds that there is sufficient evidence on record that indicate the Respondent's intention to capitalize of the fame and reputation associated with the trademark.

Fifth, the evidence on record also discloses that the Respondent has apparently linked the disputed domain name to an online advertisement network, which signifies an attempt to derive monetary gains based on the reputation associated with the mark. The use of the trademark in the disputed domain name gives rise to the inference that the Respondent ought to have registered the disputed domain name for its trademark value, for generating Internet traffic and to derive unfair monetary or commercial gain by using the Complainant's trademark, which constitutes bad faith use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, the evidence on record shows the Respondent's pattern of registration of domain names that infringe well known trademarks and the Respondent's bad faith motives of repeatedly engaging in acquiring domain names that target trademarks. All the facts and circumstances discussed cumulatively demonstrate that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds, for all the reasons discussed, 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 <travelocity.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Harini Narayanswamy/

Harini Narayanswamy

Sole Panelist

Date: June 26, 2026