

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Yoshida Kozo, Japan International Cooperation Center v. Anil Mohanty
Case No. D2026-2196

1. The Parties

Complainant is Yoshida Kozo, Japan International Cooperation Center, Japan, internally represented.

Respondent is Anil Mohanty, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <education-japan.org> ("Disputed Domain Name") is registered with DropCatch.com LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 21, 2026. On May 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 27, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 25, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on July 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on July 15, 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

Yoshida Kozo is the president of Japan International Cooperation Center (JICE), which has endeavored since its creation in 1977 to foster talented young students to facilitate the social and economic development of their countries in the 21st century. Complainant owns Japanese trademark registration Number 6203451 for the trademark JICE (registered December 6, 2019).

Complainant acquired the Disputed Domain Name <education-japan.org> on October 16, 2013, and built a website that displayed the registered trademark JICE. The website also displayed the mark EDUCATION JAPAN (hereinafter the “Mark”):



The website also included an “About EDUCATION JAPAN” subtitle linked to a webpage that explained that the EDUCATION JAPAN name signaled a source where “[y]ou will also find on-going JICE educational programs and currently available scholarships”.

Complainant used the Mark on the webpage continuously from 2013 until it detected unauthorized access to the site in June 2020, whereupon it suspended the site and then subsequently, on December 2, 2022, it deleted all data from the website and terminated its ownership of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered January 1, 2024. It resolves to an active website that displays a copy of the website that Complainant previously deleted, including prominent display of the Mark at the top of the first page. In addition, Respondent displays Complainant’s registered JICE trademark with text indicating that Complainant JICE authorizes the website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it has acquired unregistered trademark rights by virtue of its continuous use of the Mark for nearly ten years.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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 Panel finds Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. This finding is based not only on Complainant's long use of the Mark, but also on Respondent's impersonation of Complainant, which is evidence that Respondent understands and expects that Internet users recognize the Mark as having residual goodwill as a signal that it is a source of information about the educational programs offered by Complainant JICE. "The fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant's mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the related website is used) may support the complainant's assertion that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier." [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. See also *Greenspring Associates, Inc. v. Lisa Knowles, Victoria capital pty*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0265](#).

The entirety of the Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical 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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 in connection with a website that impersonates the complainant by copying the complainant's website or otherwise impersonating the complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. *Bausch & Lomb Incorporated v. thebestking mu*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4699](#) ("Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a website which is an exact copy of Complainants' actual website is not a bona fide use under the Policy.").

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used 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. See also *Alstom v. Name redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2584](#) ("Respondent's wholesale copying of Complainant's website demonstrates Respondent's awareness of Complainant.")

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <education-japan.org> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: July 29, 2026