ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ooredoo IP LLC v. my ooredoo
Case No. D2026-2074

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is my ooredoo, Tunisia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <myooredoo.store> 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 14, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 18, 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 18, 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 20, 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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was June 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Kiyoshi Tsuru, Nick J. Gardner, and Zineb Naciri Bennani as panelists in this matter on June 30, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of the Panel has submitted their 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 Ooredoo IP LLC, a Qatari company and wholly owned subsidiary of Ooredoo Q.P.S.C., an international telecommunications group headquartered in Doha, Qatar. The Complainant owns trademark registrations for OOREDOO in several jurisdictions in connection with telecommunications, digital, mobile, and related services. Some of the Complainant's marks include:

Jurisdiction	Reg. No.	Trademark	Registration Date	Class(es)
United Kingdom	UK00003017878		November 15, 2013	9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 41
European Union	012154795	ooredoo	March 5, 2014	7, 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 41

The record establishes that the Complainant, as part of the Ooredoo group, provides services and mobile applications in several markets.

The disputed domain name <myooredoo.store> was registered on October 12, 2025.

The Respondent is identified as "my ooredoo", with contact information in Tunisia. The record also shows that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves operates as "Myooredoo" and offers digital/gaming products, claiming instant delivery, secure payments, and 24/7 support services relating to digital/gaming products. Said website displays contact details in Tunisia, specifically "Tunisia, Nabeul", a Tunisian telephone number, and the email address "[…]@gmail.com".

The record also shows that the website to which the disputed domain resolves displays the Complainant's OOREDOO trademark and reproduces the Complainant's registered design mark (albeit in red):

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 the following:

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar

That it owns rights in the OOREDOO trademark, which it describes as highly distinctive and exclusively associated with the Complainant and its affiliated companies.

That the term "ooredoo" is derived from the Complainant's own company name, which is registered as a trademark in several jurisdictions, and which has been extensively used in multiple markets, which use the Complainant contends has given rise to common law rights and to a substantial reputation in connection with telecommunications, digital, and mobile services.

That OOREDOO is protected not only as a trademark but also as a trade name under Article 8 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.

That the Complainant offers its “My Ooredoo” customer mobile applications and online services across several markets, including the Maldives, Kuwait, Algeria, and Tunisia (where the Respondent has declared to reside, and where the Ooredoo group maintains a commercial presence and operates an official Ooredoo shop).

That the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its OOREDOO trademark because it incorporates said mark in its entirety. That the addition of the term “my” does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity; rather, that it reinforces the likelihood that Internet users may associate the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s services covered by its trademark, and in particular with its “My Ooredoo” services and applications which are offered in several markets, including Tunisia.

That, although the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) is disregarded under the first element, the gTLD “.store” is in this case directly related to the Complainant’s own online stores operated under the OOREDOO brand, which the Complainant contends increases confusing similarity.

That the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, which wholly reproduces the Complainant’s trademark and logo and imitates the look and feel of the Complainant’s own website, further confirms that the Respondent seeks to target the Complainant and its OOREDOO mark, which the Complainant contends is relevant to the assessment of confusing similarity under section 1.15 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“WIPO Overview 3.1”).

II. Rights or Legitimate Interests

That the Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that, since the Complainant has presented a prima facie case, the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent.

That the Respondent owns no trademark or other rights corresponding to the disputed domain name, has never been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the OOREDOO mark, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has no business or legal relationship with the Complainant.

That the Respondent cannot claim to be commonly known by the disputed domain name, having registered it anonymously, and that the Complainant’s rights long established rights predate its date of registration, the OOREDOO brand having been in use since 1987, the Complainant’s official domain name <ooredoo.com> registered since 2009, and the OOREDOO trademark registered since 2013.

That the website to which the disputed domain name resolves imitates the Complainant’s official website, reproducing the Complainant's trademark and logo, along with its red, black, and white color scheme, and its overall aesthetic.

That the Respondent has made no bona fide use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name since its date of registration.

III. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

That the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith.

That it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the OOREDOO mark when it registered the disputed domain name on October 12, 2025, given that the Complainant has used the OOREDOO brand since 1987, registered its domain name <ooredoo.com> in 2009, and secured trademark registrations for OOREDOO since 2013.

That the OOREDOO mark is well known throughout the world, and that therefore the Respondent's registration of a domain name related to said mark indicates bad faith.

That the Respondent failed to conduct a trademark availability search prior to registering the disputed domain name and is thus responsible for any resulting abusive registrations under the concept of willful blindness.

That, by using the disputed domain name to resolve to a commercial website that imitates the Complainant's branding elements, the Respondent seeks to attract users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, affiliation or endorsement thereof.

That the Respondent's use of a privacy service supports a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets out the three requirements that the complainants must prove in order to successfully request remedies:

(i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark to which the complainant has rights;
(ii) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in connection with the disputed domain name; and
(iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Given the Respondent's default and therefore, failure to specifically address the case merits as they relate to the three UDRP elements, the Panel may decide this proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed factual allegations under paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3; see also *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp*, WIPO Case No. D2012-1909).

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 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the OOREDOO mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The case file comprises evidence showing that the Complainant owns trademark registrations for OOREDOO in several jurisdictions.

The entirety of the textual element of the Complainant's mark OOREDOO is reproduced within the disputed domain name, preceded only by the term "my". The addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The OOREDOO mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to said mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7..

The incorporation of the gTLD ".store" in the disputed domain name is disregarded for purposes of the assessment of confusing similarity under the first element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1. See also *Fat Face Holdings Limited v. 方智强 (fang zhi qiang)*, WIPO Case No. D2024-0481.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 to 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 to 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 to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the OOREDOO mark, and there is no evidence in the case file showing that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name in any legitimate sense, independently from the Complainant and its trademark.

The Panel also notes that the addition of the term "my" may suggest affiliation with the Complainant. As the record reflects, "My Ooredoo" is the name under which the Complainant offers its customers mobile applications and online services in several markets, including the Maldives, Kuwait, Tunisia, and Algeria. The term "my" is therefore not likely to be a merely coincidental addition to the disputed domain name. Combined with the OOREDOO mark, it reproduces the branding under which the Complainant provides its online services and, on the balance of probabilities, could be understood by Internet users as denoting an official or affiliated channel of the Complainant rather than an independent or unrelated source.

In Tunisia, where the Respondent is reportedly located, the record establishes that the Complainant provides its OOREDOO services and applications and maintains a commercial presence, including an official OOREDOO shop, such that local Internet users are particularly likely to be familiarized with the OOREDOO brand.

The Panel further notes that the disputed name resolves to a website consisting of a digital store offering digital/gaming products and featuring the name "myooredoo", and a prominent display of the registered device mark (albeit in red).

Considering that the Complainant operates an online store that offers customers a mobile application and online services under the "My Ooredoo" brand, the fact that the Respondent has caused the disputed domain name, which entirely incorporates the Complainant's highly distinctive OOREDOO mark, to operate a website that offers digital/gaming products, constitutes passing off. Panels previously appointed under the

Policy have consistently held that a respondent's use of a domain name to impersonate a complainant or to falsely suggest sponsorship or endorsement cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1; see also *Fulham Football Club (1987) Limited, Tottenham Hostpur Public Limited, West Ham United Football Club PLC, Manchester United Limited, The Liverpool Football Club And Athletic Grounds Limited v. Domains by Proxy, Inc./ Official Tickets Ltd*, WIPO Case No. D2009-0331; and *Digital Division Limited v. Yaroslav Kariakin, meble TOV*, WIPO Case No. D2026-0672).

The Panel further notes that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves does not merely reproduce the textual element "myooredoo". It also reproduces the Complainant's registered logo (albeit in red). Accordingly, such composition and use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or otherwise confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 2.5.1 and 2.13.1. See also *JB IP, LLC v. 刘小春 (Xiao Chun Liu);* WIPO Case No. D2024-2845.

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.

The OOREDOO trademark is highly distinctive. The disputed domain name incorporates said mark in its entirety, together with the term "my", which could be understood as a reference to the Complainant's "My Ooredoo" services. Under the circumstances of this case, the record suggests that the Respondent did not select the disputed domain name by mere coincidence. Rather, the composition and use of the disputed domain name lead the Panel to infer that the Respondent has deliberately targeted the Complainant and its trademark, which constitutes opportunistic bad faith under the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent's declared residence in Tunisia is also relevant. The record establishes that the Complainant provides services in Tunisia and operates an official OOREDOO shop in Tunisia, which location is in the same area as that of the Respondent's address contained in the WhoIs record pertaining to the disputed domain name. This close proximity to the Complainant's store, together with the Complainant's established commercial presence in Tunisia, supports an inference that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its OOREDOO mark when registering the disputed domain name.

The overall look and feel of the Respondent's website further supports this conclusion. In addition to wholly reproducing the Complainant's distinctive OOREDOO mark within the disputed domain name, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves reproduces the Complainant's logo, visually referencing the Complainant's branding. The Panel further notes that the Complainant owns trademark registrations protecting OOREDOO word mark and its design mark. This further supports the conclusion that the Respondent deliberately sought to capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill.

Taken as a whole, the visual elements incorporated into the website to which the disputed domain name resolves create the false impression that said website is operated, authorized, or otherwise endorsed or sponsored by the Complainant. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent is passing off as the Complainant. Such impersonation constitutes compelling evidence that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and demonstrates that the Respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by exploiting the reputation of the Complainant's mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.4. See also *Accenture Global Services Limited v. aaron woodson*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3085.

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 <myooredoo.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kiyoshi Tsuru/
Kiyoshi Tsuru
Presiding Panelist

/Nick J. Gardner/
Nick J. Gardner
Panelist

/Zineb Naciri Bennani/
Zineb Naciri Bennani
Panelist

Date: July 14, 2026