ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Microsoft Corporation v. Milos Kopunovic
Case No. D2026-2295

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Microsoft Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is Milos Kopunovic, Serbia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <microsoftkeys.net> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 28, 2026. On May 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 29, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 29, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 5, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 June 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 25, 2026. On June 26, 2026, the Respondent requested an extension of the due date for Response under paragraphs 5(b) and 5(e) of the Rules. On June 26, 2026, the Center grated the Respondent a four-calendar day extension under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules and invited the

Complainant to comment on the Respondent’s request for a further extension under paragraph 5(e) of the Rules. As the Complainant did not object to the Respondent’s request, the Center grated the Respondent a further extension of the due date for Response until July 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal response.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on July 8, 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 1975, the Complainant is an internationally leading developer and provider of, inter alia, personal computer software systems, applications, and cloud computing services with global operations through its subsidiaries, affiliates, and/or licensees.

The Complainant owns a large number of MICROSOFT trademark registrations around the globe. According to the Complaint, the Complainant is, among many others, the owner of International Trademark Registration No. 1318242, registered on May 27, 2016, and the European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000330910, registered on May 7, 1999, both for MICROSOFT, and covering protection, inter alia, for various software related goods and services.

The Complainant also owns domain names comprising its MICROSOFT trademark, such as <microsoft.com> and <microsoft.net>.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Serbia.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 26, 2021.

Screenshots, as provided by the Complainant, show that the disputed domain name resolves to a website in English language, which is used for purportedly offering software products of the Complainant in USD. On the associated website, the MICROSOFT trademark (including logos) as well as official product images of the Complainant are prominently used without a visible disclaimer describing the (lack of) relationship between the Parties. Moreover, on the associated website, the website is explicitly branded as “MICROSOFT STORE”. In addition, a screenshot provided by the Complainant shows that the website associated with the disputed domain name is flagged as a “phishing site” and “security threat”.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions. However, the Center received a request in English language from the Respondent on June 26, 2026, seeking an extension of the deadline to file a response. Although the requested extension was granted by the Center, the Respondent ultimately did not submit any substantive response.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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 disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. See *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2007-1228.

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview 3.1 and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

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 MICROSOFT trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the MICROSOFT mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the MICROSOFT mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "keys", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

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 Respondent has not rebutted the 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.

In this regard, the Panel particularly believes that the Respondent cannot be assessed as a legitimate dealer for the Complainant's software products in light of *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903 *(*"Oki Data"*)* and thus is not entitled to use the disputed domain name accordingly*.* The criteria as set forth in Oki Data are not fulfilled in the present case. The Panel particularly notes that the website which is linked to the disputed domain name does not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant. To the contrary, the online store is expressly identified as "MICROSOFT SOTRE", thereby reinforcing the false impression that the Respondent is an official and/or authorized distributor of the Complainant's software products. This assessment is further supported by the nature of the disputed domain name, which comprises the entirety of the Complainant's MICROSOFT trademark in combination with the descriptive term "keys". In view of the Panel, this takes the Respondent out of the Oki Data safe harbour for purposes of the second element.

The Panel further notes that according to a provided screenshot by the Complainant, the website linked to the disputed domain name is flagged as a phishing site and security threat. Such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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.

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 that the Respondent must have had the Complainant and its MICROSOFT trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. It is obvious to the Panel that the Respondent has deliberately chosen the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant's well-known trademark in its entirety, to target and mislead Internet users searching for the Complainant and its products.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Panel finds that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in order to generate traffic to its own website by deliberately misleading third parties in a false belief that the associated website is either operated or at least authorized by the Complainant. The prominent use of the Complainant's MICROSOFT mark, including official product pictures of the Complainant, coupled with the explicit claim that it is a "MICROSOFT STORE" (without being authorized by the Complainant), is, in view of the Panel, sufficient evidence that the Respondent intentionally tries to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its MICROSOFT trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the associated website. This conclusion is further reinforced by the website linked to the disputed domain name, that has been flagged as a phishing site and security threat.

The Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith.

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 <microsoftkeys.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/
Kaya Köklü
Sole Panelist
Date: July 22, 2026