ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Uber Technologies, Inc. v. Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC
Case No. D2026-2014

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Uber Technologies, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC, United States, represented by Brian H. Leventhal, Attorney at Law, P.C., United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <calluber.com>, <uberbenefits.com>, <uberbolt.com>, <uberchick.com>, <ubercircle.com>, <ubercontractors.com>, <ubercrazy.com>, <uberdeliveryservice.com>, <uberdriverinsurance.com>, <ubereverywhere.com>, <uberexpress.com>, <uberfactory.com>, <ubergeist.com>, <ubergram.com>, <uberhour.com>, <uberlover.com>, <ubermain.com>, <ubermc.com>, <uberriders.com>, <ubersavings.com>, <uberscience.com>, <uberstarter.com>, and <uberwoman.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain name <uberdriverapp.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC.

The disputed domain name <uberplanet.com> is registered with Go Montenegro Domains, Inc.

The disputed domain name <uberum.com> is registered with Go Australia Domains, LLC (together the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 9, 2026. On May 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 11, and 13, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 8, 2026. The Respondent requested an additional four calendar days in which to submit its Response, in accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(b), and was granted and notified of the extension by the Center. The Response was filed with the Center on June 13, 2026. A Supplemental Filing from the Complainant was received by the Center on June 17, 2026. Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1 dated June 25, 2026, granted the Respondent’s request to file a Supplemental Filing as a response to the Complainant’s Supplemental Filing and the filing was received by the Center on June 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Dennis A. Foster as the sole panelist in this matter on June 19, 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

Founded in 2009, the Complainant was incorporated in the United States in 2010. The Complainant offers transportation services through contracted drivers based on cell phone reservations. As of December 31, 2025, the Complainant reported approximately 202 million monthly active platform users, annual revenues of USD 52 billion, and operations in more than 70 countries and 15,000 cities worldwide.

In providing its services, the Complainant operates under its UBER service mark, which is registered with many trademark authorities throughout the world, including with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) (e.g., Registration No. 3977893; registered on June 14, 2011, in: International Class 09 for software for coordinating transportation services; International Class 038 for telecommunications services for routing calls; International Class 039 for websites featuring information and bookings for transportation services; and International Class 042 for temporary use of non-downloadable software for transportation services).

The Respondent is a “long established” (the Respondent’s own words) United States company that buys and sells domain names online. At any given time, the Respondent has an inventory of several hundred thousand domain names for sale. The Respondent owns and has offered for sale or transfer all of the disputed domain names in these proceedings.

The disputed domain names, resolving to parked webpages for sale, were registered on the following dates:

<calluber.com> on March 2, 2015;
<uberbenefits.com> on January 9, 2017;
<uberbolt.com> on May 17, 2017;
<uberchick.com> on January 6, 2014;
<ubercircle.com> on December 3, 2019;
<ubercontractors.com> on December 2, 2014;
<ubercrazy.com> on February 6, 2007, and acquired by the Respondent on March 14, 2019;
<uberdeliveryservice.com> on January 19, 2018;
<uberdriverapp.com> on July 1, 2015;
<uberdriverinsurance.com> on January 16, 2014;
<uberexpress.com> on March 12, 2011;
<ubereverywhere.com> on November 5, 2015;
<uberfactory.com> on October 9, 2018;
<ubergeist.com> on October 27, 2017;
<ubergram.com> on January 9, 2016;

<uberhour.com> on February 9, 2016;
<uberlover.com> on March 6, 2017;
<ubermain.com> on December 24, 2018;
<ubermc.com> on August 13, 2015;
<uberplanet.com> on November 26, 2014;
<uberriders.com> on March 16, 2016;
<ubersavings.com> on December 20, 2005, and acquired by the Respondent on January 21, 2019;
<uberscience.com> on October 10, 2011;
<uberstarter.com> on July 27, 2012;
<uberum.com> on January 20, 2014; and
<uberwoman.com> on December 14, 2005, and acquired by the Respondent on January 17, 2018.

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 names.

In brief, the Complainant contends as follows:

- Websites attached to the disputed domain names demonstrate that the Respondent is offering all of the disputed domain names for sale at prices ranging from USD 500 to USD 49,888.

- The Respondent is a repeat cybersquatter.

- Each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to the Complainant's UBER mark, as all of the disputed domain names contain that mark together with the mere addition of one or more generic or descriptive words.

- The Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the Complainant's UBER mark in any manner, and there has never been any form of business or commercial relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent.

- The Respondent's offer to sell each of the disputed domain names for various prices constitutes neither "a bona fide offering of goods or services" nor "a legitimate noncommercial or fair use" regarding any of the disputed domain names. To the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has never been commonly known as any of the disputed domain names.

- The Complainant's UBER mark is famous throughout the world, and that by itself creates a presumption that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Moreover, the Respondent's pattern of abusive domain name registrations, as demonstrated in prior UDRP decisions, is further evidence of bad faith in registering and using the disputed domain names merely for sale.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has failed to meet its burden on the elements required under the Policy and the Complaint should be denied in relation to 16 of the disputed domain names.

In brief, the Respondent contends as follows:

- The Respondent is not a cybersquatter targeting the Complainant, but is a long-established and legitimate domain name reseller that owns and manages a large portfolio of domain names acquired for their inherent, descriptive, suggestive, acronymic, expressive, or brandable value. Moreover, the term “uber” has uses and associations beyond the Complainant, including as an intensifier meaning “super,” “extreme,” or “ultimate.”

- The Respondent consents to the transfer of the following ten (10) disputed domain names: <calluber.com>, <uberbenefits.com>, <uberchick.com>, <uberdeliveryservice.com>, <uberdriverapp.com>, <uberdriverinsurance.com>, <ubereverywhere.com>, <uberexpress.com>, <uberfactory.com>, and <uberriders.com>.

- The Respondent has a legitimate interest in the remaining sixteen (16) disputed domain names as the Respondent is in the business of creating, buying and selling domain names comprised of descriptive, geographic and generic terms, common phrases, acronyms, abbreviations, and combinations thereof. Such activity by the Respondent is a bona fide offering of goods and services. Moreover, the disputed domain names have not been used to sell goods or services competitive with those offered by the Complainant. The Respondent is only one participant in a robust after-market for the reselling of registered domain names.

- The Respondent did not register and is not using the disputed domain names in bad faith. The Respondent’s legitimate business of re-selling domain names composed of independent meanings is not based on solicitation of the Complainant, demands of payment from the Complainant, pay-per-click advertising targeting the Complainant or its competitors, phishing, impersonation, email abuse or operating services competitive with those of the Complainant. Moreover, the chronology of the disputed domain name registrations and the later evolving notoriety of the Complainant’s mark undercuts any claim of bad faith registration of the disputed domain names.

- The Respondent has not been engaged in a pattern of bad faith domain name registrations despite a mere handful of UDRP rulings against the Respondent.

C. Complainant’s Supplemental Filing

The Complainant contends as follows:

- The Respondent, as a business that specializes in the resale of domain names, should be held to a higher degree of responsibility in making sure that its actions are not trademark abuse prohibited under the Policy.

- Internationally well-known trademarks that may also be dictionary words may still be protected from abusive domain name registration under the Policy. This is especially true when such marks are famous in the country wherein a respondent resides, such as in this case where the Complainant’s UBER mark is very well known in the United States where the Respondent resides.

- The Respondent cannot deny a pattern of misconduct in the registration of domain names for sale by characterizing some thirteen (13) Policy decisions against the Respondent as a mere “handful” of such cases. Moreover, the Respondent cannot deny that it is responsible for content appearing on any of the websites attached to the disputed domain names it owns.

D. Respondent’s Supplemental Filing

The Respondent contends as follows:

- The Respondent does not contend that domainer status excuses abusive behavior, but it does allow for the good faith acquisition and resale of domain names based on common words.

- The Respondent does not deny the fame of the Complainant’s UBER mark, but does contend that such fame does not give the Complainant universal control over the common word “uber”.

- When considering the content of landing pages related to the disputed domain names, inappropriate wording thereon with respect to disputed domain names whose transfer the Respondent does not contest (as noted above under the Respondent contentions) fails to render invalid the Respondent's ownership rights to those disputed domain names that it does contest in these UDRP proceedings.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Rules require the Panel to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. See the Rules paragraph 15(a).

The Rules paragraph 10(a) gives panels the discretion to conduct proceedings in such manner as they deem appropriate under the Policy and the Rules. Under the Rules paragraph 10(c), the Panel must "ensure that the proceeding takes place with due expedition."

As noted above, the Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing on June 17, 2026, and thereafter, pursuant to Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1, the Panel allowed the Respondent to respond in its own Supplemental Filing until July 2, 2026. While the Panel finds that these Supplemental Filings are largely reiterative of each Party's positions, the Panel has decided to accept them for the sake of completeness.

The Respondent has conceded the transfer of ten (10) of the disputed domain names because their landing pages mentioned the Complainant's business. However, as there are still sixteen (16) other disputed domain names to be considered by the Panel in this case, the Panel will proceed to analyze the appropriate ownership rights to all twenty-six (26) of the disputed domain names under the same UDRP standards. The Panel finds this is both fair and expeditious.

Finally, addressing the Complainant's assertion in its Supplemental Filing regarding the Response having been filed after the Response due date and should be disregarded, the Panel, at its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, notes the Respondent's location, the nominal delay between the Response due date and the time of transmittal of the Response filing which did not affect due expedition of the proceeding, and the materiality and weight of the submission; and accordingly, to give both Parties an opportunity to present their cases, for equality purposes, accepts the Response as admissible.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has supplied copies of its registrations of its UBER service marks, one of them with the USPTO as set out above in the Factual Background section, and thus the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements for ownership of that mark per Policy paragraph 4(a)(i). See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.2.1; and *LO 337 IP Holding, LLC v. John Williams, J Entertainment ATL / John Williams, J Entertainment Productions*, WIPO Case No. D2019-2339.

All of the disputed domain names contain the Complainant's UBER mark with the addition of one or more other terms or letters. Also, the disputed domain names contain the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), which is not relevant in determining identity or confusing similarity since gTLDs are a requirement of all domain names. As a result, the Panel determines that such simple additions do not prevent a finding that all of the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's service mark. See *G4S Limited v. Daniel Graf*, WIPO Case No. D2023-5231. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that all disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a service mark in which the Complainant has rights per Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

It is now well settled under the Policy that initially the Complainant needs only make out a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names because it is difficult for the Complainant to prove a negative in this regard. If the Complainant succeeds in making out a prima facie case, then the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward to rebut that prima facie case, although the overall burden of proof remains on the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1. In the present case, the Complainant has sustained a prima facie case by establishing that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its service mark, and that the Respondent is not authorized to use that mark in any manner.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides three possible rationales, any of which would sustain the Respondent's claim to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent argues that, even without the Complainant's license or authorization with respect to use of its UBER mark, its "domainer" business of acquiring and selling thousands of domain names based on their dictionary meaning constitutes a "bona fide offering of goods or services" pursuant to Policy paragraph 4(c)(i).

In making that argument, the Respondent acknowledges that the Complainant owns trademark rights in the term "uber" that appears in all of the disputed domain names. However, the Respondent contends that "uber" is a common word in keeping with the Respondent's domainer practice of trading in only domain names containing common or generic words.

The Panel, in reviewing the Policy cases that the Respondent cites to support the argument above, concludes that this argument is not persuasive. In those cases, UDRP panels concluded that, based on respective complainants and respondents dwelling in different countries, those respondents may have been reasonably unaware of the pertinent trademark rights. See *Graftex Prodcom SRL and Graffitti - 94 R.B.I. Prodcom S.R.L. v. Piazza Affari srl, Michele Dinoia*, WIPO Case No. D2017-0148; *Centroamerica Comercial, Sociedad Anonima de Capital Variable (CAMCO) v. Michael Mann*, WIPO Case No. D2016-1709. In the present case, the Complainant and the Respondent both reside in the United States where the Complainant's UBER service mark is extremely well known. Moreover, that extreme notoriety of the UBER mark was established prior to the first registration/acquisition date (March 15, 2017) of the disputed domain names of which the Respondent refuses to concede ownership to the Complainant.

The Panel notes that merely registering a domain name comprised of a dictionary word or phrase would not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the respondent. Mere arguments that a domain name corresponds to a dictionary term/phrase or acronym, or unique/catchy or memorable term (sometimes referred to by respondents as "brandable") may not be sufficient, and panels will consider the overall facts and circumstances of the case when assessing such arguments. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.10.1.

The Panel, noting the notoriety of the Complainant's trademark and the timing of the registration of the disputed domain names, concludes that the Respondent's proposed sales of any of the disputed domain names, at prices ranging from USD 500 to USD 49,888, fail to constitute "a bona fide offering of goods or services" pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Rather, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are being used in a manner that trades off the goodwill associated with the Complainant's trademark. The fact that the Respondent registered more than 20 domain names with the term "uber", many of which combine the term with words closely associated with the Complainant's business such as "delivery service" and "riders", undermines the Respondent's claim that the disputed domain names were selected solely for their purported dictionary meanings.

With respect to Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii), the Panel can find no reason to believe that the Respondent, as the individual Michael F. Mann, or as the company Domain Asset Holdings, LLC, has ever been commonly known as any of the disputed domain names. Furthermore, because the Respondent has acknowledged that it acquired the disputed domain names solely for their re-sale at profitable prices, Policy paragraph 4(c)(iii), requiring "noncommercial or fair use" of those names, is inapplicable as well.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in any of the disputed domain names per Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Although paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four specific circumstances that may indicate that a disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, the Policy also recognizes that other circumstances may give rise to a determination that a respondent's registration and use of a disputed domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1 ("...the scenarios described in UDRP paragraph 4(b) are non-exclusive and merely illustrative...").

The Panel notes that the fame of a mark in question in a disputed domain name can create a presumption of bad faith registration and use. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4. ("Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar [...] to a well-known trademark [...] can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.") In the present case, the Complainant's UBER mark is extremely well known in the United States, the Respondent's residence, and indeed worldwide, and was famous years prior to the above-referenced March 15, 2017 date on which the first of the still-contested disputed domain names was registered. See *Uber Technologies, Inc. v. Justin Drazin*, WIPO Case No. D2026-0744 ("[t]he UBER mark is widely known..."); and *Uber Technologies, Inc. v. Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings*, LLC, WIPO Case No. D2026-1270 ("The Panel also finds bad faith use based on the fame and distinctiveness of Complainant's [...] UBER and UBER FOR BUSINESS trademarks..."). Moreover, given that the Respondent's status of a domainer means that it should have been particularly aware of the fame of the UBER service mark, the Panel finds that all the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that all the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith and has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 names, <calluber.com>, <uberbenefits.com>, <uberbolt.com>, <uberchick.com>, <ubercircle.com>, <ubercontractors.com>, <ubercrazy.com>, <uberdeliveryservice.com>, <uberdriverapp.com>, <uberdriverinsurance.com>, <ubereverywhere.com>, <uberexpress.com>, <uberfactory.com>, <ubergeist.com>, <ubergram.com>, <uberhour.com>, <uberlover.com>, <ubermain.com>, <ubermc.com>, <uberplanet.com>, <uberriders.com>, <ubersavings.com>, <uberscience.com>, <uberstarter.com>, <uberum.com>, and <uberwoman.com>, all be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dennis A. Foster/
Dennis A. Foster
Sole Panelist
Date: July 10, 2026