

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL v. Tonmoy Parves, Niche Empire
Case No. D2026-2434

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sfanti Grup Solutions SRL c/o Walters Law Group, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Tonmoy Parves, Niche Empire, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <megapersonales.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 4, 2026. On June 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 8, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 8, 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 10, 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 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Dawn Osborne as the sole panelist in this matter on July 9, 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

The Complainant is the owner of the registered trade mark MEGAPERSONALS, registered, inter alia, as United States registration number 6432591 for online social introduction services since July 27, 2021. It has owned <megapersonals.com> since June 12, 2003, and has used it for its services since March 30, 2004, presently re-directing it to <megapersonals.eu> which has also been used for its services since June 8, 2020.

The disputed domain name registered on February 28, 2026 has been used for a competing site purporting to offer online social introduction services exactly mimicking the Complainant's web site using the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark spelled correctly in its logo form as a masthead.

The Respondent has been the subject of a previous adverse decision under the UDRP in proceedings involving registration and use of the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark in other domain names.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

The disputed domain name is a typosquatting registration and is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS registered trade mark merely adding an extra letter "e".

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it and is not authorised by the Complainant. Directing the disputed domain name to a site exactly mimicking the Complainant's web site using the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark in its logo form as a masthead to suggest affiliation with the Complainant is not a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Respondent intended to confuse Internet users into believing the website attached to the disputed domain name was associated with the Complainant and its trade mark for commercial gain in full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights and business which is registration and use in bad faith. Typosquatting is bad faith per se.

The adverse decision under the UDRP in proceedings against the Respondent involving registration and use of the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark in other domain names in similar circumstances demonstrates a pattern of bad faith activity.

B. Respondent

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

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 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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark, merely adding an extra letter "e". The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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.

The Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name has been pointed to a clone of the Complainant's web site including use of the Complainant's trade mark MEGAPERSONALS in its logo form and spelled correctly, used as a masthead. The disputed domain name is being used to impersonate the Complainant. This is deceptive and so cannot be a bona fide offering of goods and services. The use is commercial and so is not legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here copycat sites and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The disputed domain name also appears to be a typosquatting registration differing from the Complainant's domain name <megapersonals.com> by a single letter "e". Typosquatting is an additional indication of a lack of rights or legitimate interests in a 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant by copying the Complainant's web site exactly, including use of the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark in its logo form spelled correctly as a masthead. The exact copying of the Complainant's web site shows the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its business. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, thereby disrupting the Complainant's business.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here copycat sites and passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Typosquatting is also indicative of bad faith.

Finally, it appears that the Respondent has been the subject of a previous adverse decision under the UDRP in proceedings involving registration and use of the Complainant's MEGAPERSONALS mark in other domain names in similar circumstances suggesting a pattern of bad faith activity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

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 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 <megapersonales.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dawn Osborne/

Dawn Osborne

Sole Panelist

Date: July 20, 2026