ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Jagex Limited v. Vladas Jurkevicius, MMO Games C. V.
Case No. D2026-2391

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jagex Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Vladas Jurkevicius, MMO Games C. V., Cyprus, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rsgoldpot.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 2, 2026. On June 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 4, 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 (Protected Protected, Shield Whois) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 5, 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 June 9, 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 June 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on July 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on July 17, 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. The Complainant submitted a supplemental filing on July 29, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company that is inter alia designing, publishing and operating online video games. Among others, the Complainant offers online role-playing games named "RuneScape" and "Old School RuneScape", which together attract about 3 million users each month since 2022. "Old School RuneScape" has been recognized by the Guiness World Records for being the largest free-to-play multiplayer online-role-playing game with over 300 million accounts. "RuneScape" has celebrated its 25th anniversary in January 2026. Its online games are commonly abbreviated by "RS" and "OSRS".

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations protecting its online video games, including the trademark RS. According to the Complaint, the Complainant is, among others, the owner of:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00905122916 (word), registered on May 10, 2007, for RS, covering protection for entertainment services as part of class 41;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00002302308 (word), registered on December 27, 2002, for RUNESCAPE, covering, inter alia, protection for entertainment services as part of class 41; and
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003710504 (word), registered on November 10, 2023, for RS GOLD, covering, inter alia, protection for entertainment services as part of class 41.

The Complainant further owns and operates its main website at the domain name <runescape.com>, registered on January 10, 2000. In addition, the Complainant owns various further domain names which incorporate the RS trademark, such as <rsclassic.com> (registered on April 1, 2004), <rsmarket.net> (registered on August 10, 2006), and <buy-rsgold.com> (registered on February 13, 2009).

The Respondent is reportedly located in Cyprus.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 8, 2015.

According to provided screenshots by the Complainant, the disputed domain name redirects users to a website at another domain name, purportedly enabling sales of in-game gold, a digital currency used in the Complaint's online games, as well as many other virtual coins, tokens, and similar currencies for other games of different commercial origin.

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 contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the second and third elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent argues that since 2015, it has operated a bona fide business offering in-game gold for the Complainant's online games. According to the Respondent, it uses the Complainant's RS trademark solely in a descriptive manner to identify the products offered and not to target the Complainant or its business. The Respondent particularly argues that the secondary-market sale of in-game gold for the Complainant's games is legitimate and lawful.

The Respondent therefore maintains that it registered and has used the disputed domain name in good faith for the allegedly legitimate purpose of supplying the secondary market for in-game gold relating to the Complainant's games. In support of this position, the Respondent points to the existence of numerous other

independent suppliers offering similar in-game currencies. The Respondent also states that its commercial activity under the disputed domain name ceased in 2025.

In light of the above, the Respondent is convinced that the Complaint qualifies as a Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH").

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; and

(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.

It is noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

6.1. Procedural Issues: Complainant's Supplemental Filing

Paragraph 10 of the UDRP Rules vests the panel with the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition.

Unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel. Noting the timing (shortly before the Decision deadline, and almost three weeks after the Response was filed), the Panel declines to consider the Complainant's supplemental filing. However, the Panel notes that if the supplemental filing was considered it would not have altered the below findings.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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

The entirety of the RS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The website at the disputed domain name refers to the Complainant's trademarks. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "gold" and "pot", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the RS 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 Complainant has credibly submitted that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use the Complainant's RS trademark.

The Respondent, in return, failed to rebut this prima facie case. In particular, the Respondent failed to successfully rely on the alleged descriptive use of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Panel particularly finds that the Respondent cannot be assessed as a legitimate dealer or reseller on a secondary market for the Complainant's in-game currency 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 comprising the RS trademark accordingly. The criteria as set forth in "Oki Data" are not fulfilled in the present case. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name does not directly resolve to a website but rather redirects Internet users to a competing website at a different domain name that offers not only in-game gold for the Complainant's online games, but also virtual coins, token and other currencies for competing third-party games of other commercial origin. However, even if such website was directly resolving from the disputed domain name, the Panel notes that the use of the Complainant's RS trademark in the disputed domain name to offer competing goods in such manner would not satisfy the "Oki Data" requirements.

In view of the Panel, the potential existence of other parties offering similar services like the Respondent is irrelevant to the assessment under the Policy. Whether the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests depends on its own conduct and the composition and use of the disputed domain name.

Consequently, 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 finds that the Respondent must have had the Complainant, its popular online games and the RS trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. It is obvious to the Panel that the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's RS trademark in its entirety combined with the terms "gold" and "pot", which can be assessed as descriptive for the allegedly traded in-game currency, demonstrates its knowledge of the Complainant and intention to target the Complainant and its services in order to divert Internet users to the Respondent's own competing offering for commercial gain. Further, the Respondent concedes awareness of the Complainant's marks in its Response.

With respect to use in bad faith, the Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to redirect misled Internet users to a website offering services competing with those of the Complainant. Contrary to the Respondent's submissions (and as already discussed under the second element), such use does not constitute a legitimate way of supplying a secondary market. Instead, the Panel finds that by using the Complainant's RS trademark in the disputed domain name to divert Internet traffic to a competing website, the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website at another domain name with competing services and creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant, its popular online games and the RS trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website. In view of the Panel, such conduct falls within the circumstances described in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further considers that Internet users are redirected to a website that offers not only in-game currency for the Complainant's games, but also online currencies for numerous online games of different commercial origin. This further reinforces the Panel's finding that the Respondent is trading on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's popular online games and the RS trademark in order to promote its own business.

In addition, the Panel is not persuaded by the Respondent's allegation that other independent suppliers likewise offer in-game currencies for the Complainant's games. The potential existence of similar third party activities neither legitimizes the Respondent's conduct nor precludes a finding of bad faith, which needs to be assessed on the basis of the Respondent's individual conduct and intentions relating to the disputed domain name in this proceeding.

All in all, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

In view of the findings above in favour of the Complainant, the Panel does not comply with the Respondent's request and makes no finding of RDNH.

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 <rsgoldpot.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/
Kaya Köklü
Sole Panelist
Date: July 31, 2026