

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jagex Limited v. chun wei li
Case No. D2026-2405

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is chun wei li, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <cheaprs2gold.com>, <rsgoldsave.com>, <rsgold07.com>, <rsgold2u.com>, <rsgold4us.com>, <rs2hot.com>, <rs4acc.com>, <rs4golds.com>, <rs4pl.com>, <rs4sale.com>, <rs4uk.com>, <runescapegoldfast.com>, <runescapegolds2u.com>, <runescapegold2u.com>, <runescapepal.com>, and <07-runescapegold.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 3, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted For Privacy) 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 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on July 6, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant was incorporated on April 28, 2000. Since incorporation it has carried on the business of designing, developing, publishing and operating online video games and other electronic-based entertainment. The Complainant offers online role-playing games, including RuneScape and Old School RuneScape, which together attract more than 3 million users each month. Old School RuneScape has over 300 million accounts and has been recognised by the Guinness World Records for being the largest free-to-play massively multiplayer online role-playing games with over 300 million accounts. RuneScape has celebrated its 25th anniversary in January 2026.

The Complainant is the registered proprietor of numerous trademarks and other intellectual property rights worldwide. The Complainant owns extensive rights covering RUNESCAPE, or RS, including the following:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00002302308 for RUNESCAPE (word), registered on December 27, 2002, and applied for on June 7, 2002, in international classes 16, 25 and 41; and
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00905122916 for RS (word), registered on May 10, 2007, and applied for on May 22, 2006, in international class 41.

The Complainant owns the domain name <runescape.com>, which has resolved to an active website relating to online video games since at least as early as August 17, 2000.

The disputed domain names were registered at various dates between November 3, 2006, and November 26, 2018. At the date of the Complaint, most of the disputed domain names resolved to or were redirected to the disputed domain name <rs4uk.com>, offering RuneScape and Old School RuneScape in-game gold, a currency used in the Complainant's games. At previous times the disputed domain names resolved to websites displaying the Complainant's trademark and product imagery, purporting to offer for sale cheap in-game currency used in the Complainant's game without disclosing the lack of relationship with the Complainant and in the majority of cases purporting to be a RS gold seller online.¹ At the date of the Decision, the disputed domain names either redirect to a website at one of the disputed domain names, <rs4uk.com> with the previously described content, or they do not direct to active websites, displaying the message "This site can't be reached" or to an error page. One of the disputed domain names resolves to a blog style page related to various video games, but it was previously (around November 13, 2013) used to resolve to a website offering for sale RUNESCAPE in-game gold items, displaying the Complainant's RUNESCAPE trademark and product imagery.

The Respondent appears to be located in China.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that its rights in the trademarks RUNESCAPE and RS significantly pre-date the registration of the disputed domain names. It contends that its trademarks acquired substantial goodwill and reputation so that they are recognized by the public as distinctive of the Complainant's services.

¹As part of a panel's general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel has undertaken limited factual research into matters of public record, namely how the disputed domain names were used at the registration date. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

The Complainant relies on prior UDRP decisions where panels found that the Complainant does have common law trademark rights in the terms RUNESCAPE and RS, given its extensive and comprehensive use of the terms over a lengthy period of time and its strong reputation. Furthermore, the Complainant contends that it has built up substantial recognition in the public domain for their trademarks through consistent use in connection with its highly popular product over a sustained period of time. This is evidenced by public endorsement of the Complainant's trademarks on social media and user generated content relating to the goods and services offered by the Complainant under its trademarks.

Further, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, as follows:

- the disputed domain names <07-runescapegold.com>, <runescapegold2u.com>, <runescapegoldfast.com>, <runescapegold2u.com>, and <runescapepal.com> incorporate the Complainant's RUNESCAPE trademark in its entirety with the addition of non-distinctive terms, which do nothing to alter the overall impression in the eyes of the average Internet user;
- the disputed domain names <rsgold07.com>, <rsgold2u.com>, <rsgold4us.com>, and <rsgoldsave.com> incorporate the RS and RS GOLD mark in their entirety, with the addition of non-distinctive terms which do nothing to alter the overall impression in the eyes of the average Internet user; and
- the disputed domain names <rs2hot.com>, <rs4acc.com>, <rs4pl.com>, <rs4sale.com>, <rs4uk.com>, <cheaprs2gold.com>, and <rs4golds.com> incorporate the Complainant's RS mark in its entirety or in the alternative the RUNESCAPE mark abbreviated to RS with the addition of non-distinctive terms which do nothing to alter the overall impression in the eyes of the average Internet user.

The inclusion of terms, numbers, and letters such as "gold" "UK", "4", "2", "u", "save", and "cheap" should not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the addition of these do nothing to alter the impression generated by the disputed domain names in the eyes of the average Internet user.

As regards the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have, and has never had, authorisation to use the Complainant's trademarks in relation to online video games, nor any other goods and services protected by such trademarks. Further, the disputed domain names were registered between November 3, 2006 and November 26, 2018 and by that dates the Complainant already had extensive rights (both registered and unregistered) in its trademarks, with a notable online presence.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names to resolve to or have resolved to the website at the domain name <rs4uk.com> which offers for sale RuneScape and Old School RuneScape in-game gold, which constitutes a violation of the Complainant's terms and conditions, game rules and also represents copyright infringement. The Complainant submits that under such circumstances, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names cannot be a bona fide offering of goods or services, due to illegal activity. Furthermore, the Respondent's offering of in-game RuneScape gold unfairly competes with the Complainant's games, specifically in relation to online video games and entertainment services which are services protected by the Complainant's trademarks.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant argues that the Respondent was unequivocally aware of the Complainant's trademarks, given the Respondent's deliberate impersonation of the Complainant's trademarks and the use of such trademarks by the Respondent to sell the Complainant's games' currency, and the Complainant's RuneScape and Old School RuneScape in-game assets. In addition, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is free riding on the success of the RS and RUNESCAPE trademarks of the Complainant including by use of the Complainant's well-known in-game assets and promotional material, including but not limited to the use of promotional imagery relating to the Complainant's games on the homepage and use of in-game icons. The Complainant submits that the only plausible explanation is that the Respondent's service impersonates the Complainant's games or otherwise intentionally uses the Complainant's copyright-protected works and adopts confusingly similar names and assets, with a view to diverting traffic from the Complainant's websites in order to promote the illegitimate sale of the Complainant's games' currencies.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”. Likewise, paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, provides that “the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence”.

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names, and (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”, and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated 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 trademarks RS and RUNESCAPE for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The date of registration of the Complainant's trademarks is not considered relevant for the first element of the Policy, but it may bear on a panel's further substantive determination under the second and third elements. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.2.

The Panel finds the Complainant's trademarks RS, respectively RUNESCAPE are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Eleven of the 16 disputed domain names, namely the disputed domain names <cheaps2gold.com>, <rsgoldsave.com>, <rsgold07.com>, <rsgold2u.com>, <rsgold4us.com>, <rs2hot.com>, <rs4acc.com>, <rs4golds.com>, <rs4pl.com>, <rs4sale.com>, and <rs4uk.com>, wholly incorporate the RS trademark of the Complainant, or an abbreviated form of the RUNESCAPE trademark of the Complainant, as a variation of the Complainant's trademark. The indicated disputed domain names also incorporate other terms or elements, namely geographic terms (“pl”, “uk”) and/or the descriptive terms (“cheap”, “gold”, “save”, “hot”, “acc”, “golds”, “sale”), and/or numbers with or without letters (“2”, “07”, “2u”, “4us”, “4”).

The remaining five of 16 disputed domain names, namely the disputed domain names <runescapegoldfast.com>, <runescapegolds2u.com>, <runescapegold2u.com>, <runescapepal.com>, and <07-runescapegold.com> wholly incorporate the RUNESCAPE trademark of the Complainant. The indicated disputed domain names also incorporate other terms or elements, namely descriptive terms (“gold”, “fast”, “golds”, “pal”), and/or numbers with or without letters (“2u”, “07”) and a hyphen in one case.

In both situations, although the addition of the above terms or letters may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such terms or letters does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the respective marks for the purposes of the Policy, because the RS, respectively RUNESCAPE trademark remain recognizable in each of them. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.8, and 1.9. Also, use of hyphens does not prevent the confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademark.

It is the settled view of panels applying the Policy that the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") (here ".com") may be disregarded under the first element test. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that all 16 disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's RS, respectively RUNESCAPE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has declared that the Respondent does not have, and has never had, authorisation to use the Complainant's RUNESCAPE and RS trademarks in relation to online video games, nor any other goods and services protected by the mentioned trademarks.

The Panel accepts that the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorised the Respondent to use the RS or RUNESCAPE trademarks. The Panel also notes that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and finds that the use of the disputed domain names to offer for sale in-game currency for the Complainant's games precludes any argument that the disputed domain name is being used for noncommercial purposes, within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

In what concerns the possible application of the circumstances described in paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, according to the un rebutted evidence put forward by the Complainant, the Respondent used the disputed domain names to resolve to or to redirect to the website at "www.rs4uk.com", offering for sale RuneScape and Old School RuneScape in-game gold, displaying the Complainant's trademarks, using promotional imagery closely associated with the Complainant, without disclosing the lack of affiliation with the Complainant. Therefore, such use cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services, or fair use under the Policy.

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.

According to the unrebutted assertions of the Complainant, its RS and RUNESCAPE trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain names and were widely used in commerce. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark. They wholly incorporate the RS or RUNESCAPE trademark, mostly as their initial element. The Respondent provided no explanations for why it registered the disputed domain names. Given also the content on the websites at the disputed domain names, as detailed above, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's business and trademark rights at the time of registering the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes that one of the disputed domain names, <rs4sale.com> was registered on November 3, 2006, before the registration date for the trademark RS of the Complainant, i.e. May 10, 2007, which was nonetheless applied for on May 22, 2006, before the registration of the indicated disputed domain name. Moreover, the Complainant has provided evidence showing long time use of its trademarks RS and RUNESCAPE. The Panel agrees with previous UDRP decisions that held that the Complainant has proved recognition in the public domain for their trademarks through consistent use in connection with its highly popular product over a sustained period of time, and has thus proved unregistered trademark rights. See, e.g. *Jagex Limited v. can wang*, Wu Chen, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0680](#), where the panel has held that "[t]he Complainant's services, particularly the RuneScape game has come to be known as RS, the Complainant's trademark, which has acquired distinctiveness and fame as shown by a third party rankings;" Moreover, according to the uncontested statements of the Complainant, RS is a common abbreviation of RUNESCAPE, which predated the registration of the <rs4sale.com> disputed domain name. Therefore, on balance, the Panel makes the same inference with respect to this disputed domain name, namely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's business and trademark rights at the time of registering it, this inference being further supported by the data available from the Internet archive, which showed that the website to which it resolved shortly after the registration of this disputed domain name displayed reference to the RUNESCAPE game of the Complainant (at least around January 9, 2007).

Additionally, the disputed domain names redirect or used to resolve to websites that offered for sale RuneScape and Old School RuneScape in-game gold, using the Complainant's promotional imagery, in the absence of authorisation from the Complainant. In the Panel's view, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks regarding the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or the products offered on it. Pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, this constitutes evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The fact that some of the disputed domain names no longer resolve to an active website does not change the above findings in the circumstances of the case. Panels have found that the nonuse of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the prior use of the disputed domain names made by the Respondent and its failure to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names that are currently not in use does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <cheaprs2gold.com>, <rsgoldsave.com>, <rsgold07.com>, <rsgold2u.com>, <rsgold4us.com>, <rs2hot.com>, <rs4acc.com>, <rs4golds.com>, <rs4pl.com>, <rs4sale.com>, <rs4uk.com>, <runescapegoldfast.com>, <runescapegolds2u.com>, <runescapegold2u.com>, <runescapepal.com>, and <07-runescapegold.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: July 14, 2026