

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SIA “Bīlešu Serviss PLG” v. Janis Daube
Case No. D2026-1984

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SIA “Bīlešu Serviss PLG”, Latvia, represented by Sorainen ZAB SIA, Latvia.

The Respondent is Jānis Daube, Latvia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bilesuserviss.com> is registered with EuroDNS S.A. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2026. On May 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 11, 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 (Unidentified Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 12, 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 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was June 15, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on June 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on June 25, 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, a Latvian company, has provided wholesale and retail ticketing services at the domain name <bilesuserviss.lv> since 2000. The Complainant is the proprietor of the following trademark registrations:

- Latvian Trademark Registration No. M60 230 for BIĻEŠU SERVISS BILESUSERVISS.LV (device mark), registered on February 20, 2009, for services in classes 35 and 41;
- Latvian Trademark Registration No. M81 110 for BIĻEŠU SERVISS PLG (device mark), registered on October 20, 2025, for services in class 41.

The record contains evidence that the Respondent is a board member of SIA Bilešu paradīze, a Latvian company engaged in online ticketing services at the domain name <bilesuparadize.lv>.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 21, 2025. At the time of this Decision, it did not resolve to an active website. The record contains evidence that it previously redirected Internet users to the domain name <bilesuparadize.lv>.

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 it has operated in the Latvian online ticketing market at the domain name <bilesuserviss.lv> since 2000. Its trademark rights in the mark BIĻEŠU SERVISS BILESUSERVISS.LV predate by many years the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent, who is a board member of the Complainant's main competitor in the Latvian online ticketing market, could not have been unaware of the Complainant and its trademark rights. The disputed domain name was registered to mislead Internet users who mistakenly entered the disputed domain name <bilesuserviss.com>, rather than the Complainant's website address at <bilesuserviss.lv>. The disputed domain name diverted users to the Respondent's company's website and represents a form of typosquatting.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Its arguments may be summarized as follows: the Complainant's marks are only protected within Latvia, but the Respondent selected the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", which is intended for a global audience. Internet users outside Latvia would not associate the disputed domain name with the Complainant or its trademarks. The dominant element of the BIĻEŠU SERVISS BILESUSERVISS.LV is a graphical logo which is not legible due to the specific form of the letters used. The other mark is dominated by the element "PLG" in bright colors. The words "biļešu serviss" means "ticket service" in Latvian, which lacks distinctiveness. The Respondent's use of these common descriptive words does not give rise to any inference that the Respondent sought to target the Complainant or its trademark rights.

The Respondent intends to use the disputed domain name in connection with the promotion and provision of ticketing services. The Respondent selected the disputed domain name because it consists of a descriptive expression that accurately and directly refers to such services and because the disputed domain name was available for registration. The fact that the disputed domain name has not yet been actively developed and

currently resolves to an inactive webpage does not negate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests where the domain name comprises a descriptive or generic term that the Respondent is entitled to use in its ordinary meaning.

The Respondent further contends that the disputed domain name resolves to an empty page, and this demonstrates that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent has acquired the disputed domain name only a year ago, so passive holding of a domain name for such a short period cannot be interpreted as evidence of bad faith use.

The Respondent is not avoiding submitting a response and is not concealing his identity or contact details.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (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 Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

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 Panel finds the BĪĻEŠU SERVISS BILESUSERVISS.LV 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 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 Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name and finds that it contains the dominant elements of the Complainant's BIĻEŠU SERVISS BILESUSERVISS.LV mark. Further, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's domain name at <bilesuserviss.lv>, albeit with a different gTLD. There is a risk that Internet users will not notice the different gTLD. Therefore, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Respondent argues that the dictionary meaning of the words "biļešu serviss" is "ticket services", in which the Respondent plans to engage. The record, however, indicates that the Respondent is already engaged in ticket services as the Complainant's competitor and had used the disputed domain name to redirect to its own, competing website. Given the clear evidence of targeting the Complainant, the Panel finds that such conduct is not consistent with preparations to use the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is it consistent with a finding of fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.2 and 2.4.

The Respondent argues that the disputed domain name was available for registration and on that basis, the Respondent could legitimately register it. The Panel finds that, under the Policy, the availability of a domain name for registration does not, in itself, establish that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in it.

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 disputed domain name was registered more than 15 years after the Complainant registered its BIĻEŠU SERVISS BILESUSERVISS.LV trademark, and more than 20 years after the Complainant established its online ticketing service at the domain name <bilesuserviss.lv>. The composition of the disputed domain name therefore implies a connection with the Complainant. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1 and 3.1.3.

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. The Panel notes that publicly available information confirms the Complainant's assertion that the Parties are the dominant competitors in the Latvian online event ticketing market.¹ Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the registration and use of the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to the website of the Complainant's direct competitor in Latvia, is conduct clearly indicative of an intent to disrupt the business of a competitor. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.3.

The Respondent argues that the disputed domain name comprises descriptive words and was selected purely for its potential future development in connection with ticketing services.

The Panel finds such arguments unpersuasive. The Parties have been competitors in the Latvian market for decades. It is entirely implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant, regardless of the level of distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark. The evidence indicates that the Respondent deliberately

¹Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

targeted the Complainant. The Respondent has provided no evidence supporting good-faith conduct, and the Panel does not find the Respondent's claims regarding descriptive meaning convincing in the context of the Parties established and distinct branding, with both Parties operating as direct competitors in the same geographic market.

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 <bilesuserviss.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: July 9, 2026