ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hyatt Corporation, and Hyatt International Corporation v.
Redacted for Privacy
Case No. D2026-2310

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Hyatt Corporation and Hyatt International Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented by DLA Piper US LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Redacted for Privacy, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hyattcorp.com> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (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 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens 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

For nearly 70 years, the Complainants, which are part of the same group of companies, operate in international hotel management providing hotel services under the for HYATT brand throughout the world through their affiliates, licensees, franchisees and authorized hotel owners.

The Complainants have obtained numerous trademark registrations for the HYATT trademark (hereafter "the HYATT Trademark" or "the Trademark") throughout different jurisdictions (including numerous trademark registrations in China), with the United States trademarks owned by Hyatt Corporation and the remaining registrations owned by Hyatt International Corporation. These registrations notably include the following:

- Chinese trademark registration No. 1708880, for HYATT (word mark), registered on February 7, 2002;
- Indian trademark registration No. 2788002, for HYATT (word mark), registered on August 7, 2014;
- European Union trademark registration No. 000031575, for HYATT (word mark), registered on November 16, 1998; and
- Brazilian trademark registration No. 820066311, for HYATT (word mark), registered on September 28, 1999.

The Complainants have built an extensive worldwide presence, with over 1,500 hotel properties in 80 countries (including China).

The Complainants own and operate several domain names that incorporate the HYATT trademark, such as <hyatt.com>. The website under the domain name <hyatt.com> is the Complainants' official website, allowing customers to search for HYATT hotels all over the world and make reservations.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 19, 2026. It redirects to the Complainants' official website under the domain name <hyatt.com>. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name was used for a phishing scam. In May 2026, the Respondent used the disputed domain name for sending email communications to a third party pretending to be the Complainants' corporate director of purchasing, to inquire on the potential purchase of TV's and laser projectors from that third party.

On May 18, 2026, the Complainants' counsels sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent, but the latter did not respond. According to the Complaint, the Complainants continue to receive reports from third parties that the Respondent continues its phishing scam.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

First, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the well-known HYATT Trademark, as it includes the Trademark in its entirety, together with the generic corporate designation "corp".

Second, the Complainants contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has made no bona fide offering of goods or services in connection with the disputed domain name, and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it, as it is using the disputed domain name to operate a phishing scam. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainants have not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the HYATT Trademark or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the HYATT Trademark.

The Complainants finally contend that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainants assert that, given the worldwide reputation of the HYATT Trademark, the Respondent was or should have been aware of the HYATT Trademark well prior to registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's knowledge of the HYATT Trademark also results from the fact that the Respondent is using it for a phishing scam. The use of the disputed domain name for sending phishing emails – especially those where a complainant's employee or officer is impersonated – is clearly in bad faith. Failure to respond to the Complainants' demand letter also suggests the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith. Moreover, the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainants' official website, further misleading consumers to believe that the disputed domain name is associated or affiliated with the Complainants.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

(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 disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

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

The only difference between the HYATT Trademark and the disputed domain name is the addition of the suffix "corp". Although the addition of this term 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 Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Further, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded in the confusing similarity test.

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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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.

According to the Complaint, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent, the Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainants in any way. There is no evidence on the available record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either.

On the contrary, the Panel first notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the well-known HYATT Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the suffix "corp", which likely refers to the term "corporation", which is part of the Complainants' corporate names. The composition of the disputed domain name by itself indicates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainants, and as such prevents a finding of rights or legitimate interests on behalf of the Respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The Panel further notes that the Complainants have filed evidence that the disputed domain name was used for operating a phishing scam. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for sending email communications to a third party pretending to be one of the Complainants' corporate director of purchasing and explaining that a Complainants' entity was willing to buy TV's and laser projectors. This email communication's footer depicts the HYATT Trademark and logo and are well suited to induce the recipient into falsely believing that the email is indeed sent by the Complainants' director of purchasing.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation and phishing , can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Panel notes that the Respondent has composed the disputed domain name by reproducing the HYATT Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the suffix "corp", which likely refers to the term "corporation" which is part of the Complainants' corporate names. Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly where the complainant's trademark is widely known as it is the case here, and the respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the trademark, panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2. Taking into account the reputation of the Complainants' HYATT Trademark, registered decades before the disputed domain name (including in China, where the Respondent is purportedly located) and widely used worldwide (including on the Internet), the Panel takes the view that the Respondent was, more likely than not, well aware of the Complainant's HYATT Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name and registered it with the intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainants.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activities, here impersonation and phishing, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. In the present case, as explained above, the Complainants have filed evidence that the disputed domain name is used for fraudulent purposes. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for sending emails to a third party pretending to be the Complainants' corporate director of purchasing and explaining that the Complainants were willing to buy products. The email's footer clearly depicts the HYATT Trademark and logo and are well suited to induce the recipients into falsely believing that the emails are genuinely sent by a Complainants' employee. The intention to mislead customers is further supported by the fact that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainants' official website: the recipients, who would be willing to check whether the disputed domain name is indeed linked to the Complainants, could be induced to falsely believing that the disputed domain name is associated or affiliated with the Complainants as it directs to its official website. This points even more to the Respondent's intention to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainants.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <hyattcorp.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Mireille Buydens/
Mireille Buydens
Sole Panelist
Date: June 19, 2026