

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jagex Limited v. yuzhu wang, yidawangluo, wang yulong
Case No. D2026-2437

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are yuzhu wang, yidawangluo, China ("First Respondent"); wang yulong, China ("Second Respondent"), self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <rsgoldfast.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

The disputed domain name <rsmalls.com> is registered with Bizcn.com, Inc.

The disputed domain name <rsorder.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc.

GoDaddy.com, LLC, Bizcn.com, Inc. and NameCheap, Inc. are separately and collectively referred to below as the "Registrar".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English 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 names. On June 6 and June 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondent (Redacted For Privacy / Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 10, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant either to file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or, alternatively, to demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on June 12, 2026.

On June 10, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <rsmalls.com> is Chinese. On June 12, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the original due date for Response was July 6, 2026. On June 18, 2026, the Center received email communications from both Respondents, in which the First Respondent objected to consolidation of the disputes regarding different registrants and requested permission to file a Response in Chinese; and the Second Respondent objected to consolidation of the disputes regarding different registrants and objected to the use of English in the proceeding regarding his disputed domain name, requesting that Chinese be the language of that proceeding. On June 30, 2026, in accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(b), the Response due date was extended until July 10, 2026 at the request of the First Respondent. Each Respondent filed its own Response in Chinese with the Center on July 9, 2026; with the First Respondent filing annexes to its Response on July 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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.

On July 31, 2026, the Complainant sent an unsolicited supplemental filing to the Center in English. On August 3, 2026, the First Respondent sent an email communication to the Center in Chinese and English regarding the unsolicited supplemental filing.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a United Kingdom company founded in 2000. It designs, develops, publishes, and operates online video games and other electronic-based entertainment. It offers “RuneScape” and “Old School RuneScape”, which are massively multiplayer online role-playing games. The two games have averaged a total of over 3 million active users per month since October 2022. Old School RuneScape has over 300 million player accounts. Players earn in-game currency, known as “gold”, through normal gameplay or by buying “RuneScape Bonds” with real money from the Complainant. Gold can be exchanged for in-game items that are useful in gameplay. The Complainant holds multiple trademark registrations, including the following:

- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00002302308 for RUNESCAPE, registered on December 27, 2002;
- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00905122916 for RS, registered on May 10, 2007;
- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00003710504 for RS GOLD, registered on November 10, 2023;
- European Union trademark registration number 018578054 for RS OLD SCHOOL, registered on August 1, 2022; and

– United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00003478102 for OSRS, registered on August 9, 2020.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant has also registered domain names, including the domain name <runescape.com> that it has used with an online video game website since 2000. The Complainant has multiple social media accounts for each of RuneScape and Old School RuneScape. It has had a RuneScape YouTube channel since 2005, and a RuneScape Facebook page since November 2008, the latter of which now has over 950,000 followers. On social media, RuneScape is frequently referred to as “RS” while Old School RuneScape is frequently referred to as “OSRS” or “RS Old School”. The third major version of the game is called “RuneScape 3”.

The First Respondent is a Chinese individual named “yuzhu wang (王玉柱)” (which may be transliterated as “Wang Yuzhu” and, in respect of one disputed domain name, his organization “yidawangluo” (which may be a transliteration of “一大网络”, meaning “a big network”). The First Respondent’s email sender name is identical to a domain name associated with a game currency website. The Second Respondent is a Chinese individual named “wang yulong (王玉龙)” (which may be transliterated as “Wang Yulong”), as in his email sender name when he filed his Response, although earlier in this proceeding his email sender name was “王玉花” (which may be transliterated as “Wang Yuhua”). The Respondents purportedly lease their respective disputed domain names for commercial operations to a United Kingdom company named Whisper Games Limited under agreements executed in 2022 and 2020. That company was not incorporated until September 26, 2023 and it files its accounts as a dormant company. Its sole director is the First Respondent.¹

The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names shown below:

Disputed domain name	Date of registration	Registrant name
<rsorder.com>	April 1, 2008	yuzhu wang, yidawangluo
<rsgoldfast.com>	April 3, 2013	yuzhu wang
<rsmalls.com>	June 28, 2013	wang yulong

The disputed domain name <rsorder.com> resolves to a website in English that prominently displays a logo featuring the letters RS above RSORDER. It is described in the header as a “fast, safe, and professional RS products site”. It offers for sale OSRS gold and RS3 gold, as well as in-game items. The website presents RSOrder as an RS gold and services provider and displays news items, regarding “Old School RuneScape” and other topics. The homepage footer lists the website operator as Whisper Games Limited (showing the registered address of the United Kingdom company).

The disputed domain name <rsgoldfast.com> resolves to a website in English titled “RSGoldFast” that offers for sale OSRS gold and RS3 gold, as well as in-game items. According to the website, it was founded in 2008 and helps RS players with their gold needs. It displays anonymous customer reviews and also offers guides to read for Old School RS. The homepage footer lists the website operator as Whisper Games Limited (showing the registered address of the United Kingdom company). It also includes a disclaimer in small type that reads “Registered Names and Trademarks are the copyright and property of their respective owners”.

The disputed domain name <rsmalls.com> resolves to a website in English titled “RS Malls” that prominently displays the letters RS alongside the word MALLS. It offers for sale OSRS gold and RS3 gold. The website explains that RS gold is the currency of the RS game and that buying it on this site will save players time and effort in the game. It displays anonymous customer reviews and also offers guides to

¹ The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has searched the United Kingdom Companies House register (<https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/>), which is a matter of public record, to verify the evidence that the Parties submitted regarding Whisper Games Limited, the alleged operator of the websites associated with the disputed domain names. The Panel considers this process of verification useful in assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

read for Old School RS. The homepage footer displays a link to terms and conditions, which list the website operator as Whisper Games Limited.

According to screenshots taken by the Respondents after the Complaint was filed, the three websites now display a disclaimer in small text in the same format (in different contrasting colors) above their respective titles. The disclaimer in the homepage footer on the website associated with the disputed domain name <rsgoldfast.com> is now more detailed and includes the Complainant's name and RuneScape website address, the homepage footer on the website associated with the disputed domain name <rsorder.com> now displays a similar disclaimer; as do the terms and conditions on the websites associated with all three disputed 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <rsgoldfast.com> is confusingly similar to its RS and RS GOLD trademarks. The disputed domain names <rsorder.com> and <rsmalls.com> are confusingly similar to its RS or RUNESCAPE trademarks. Further, the Respondent has copied content from and relating to the Complainant's games onto the websites associated with the disputed domain names.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. There is no believable or realistic reason for registration or use of the disputed domain names, other than to take advantage of the Complainant's rights and reputation. The Respondents use them in connection with websites that engage in real-world trading, which is a violation of the Complainant's terms and conditions, its end-user license agreement, and the games' rules. Use of a domain name for illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. The Respondents' sale of in-game gold competes with the Complainant's sale of in-game currency. The Respondents do not have, and has never had, authorization to use the RuneScape brands in relation to online video games, nor any other goods and services protected by the Complainant's trademarks. The Respondents' passing off does not benefit from any of the defenses under the Policy.

The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant enjoys a substantial reputation in its marks. The Respondents were unequivocally aware of them, given the Respondent's deliberate impersonation of the Complainant's RuneScape brands and the use of those brands to sell in-game currency and in-game assets. The Respondents use the Complainant's logo, user interface ("UI") elements, and icons from the games. The only plausible explanation is that the Respondents' 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 games' currencies. The Respondents use the Complainant's trademarks and game assets to sell similar and competing goods and services.

B. First Respondent

The First Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names <rsorder.com> and <rsgoldfast.com>.

Although the Complainant has registered the RUNESCAPE series of trademarks in China under numbers 5387715, 5387716, and 8405954, it has not registered RS, RS GOLD, RS OLD SCHOOL, or OSRS in China. The Complainant's selective registration practice demonstrates that it does not believe that RS or

RSGOLD possesses distinctiveness suitable for independent trademark protection in China, and has in fact waived its right to claim trademark rights in China for such abbreviations and combinations. Further, the Complainant's Chinese trademark registrations only cover "online game entertainment services", not "virtual asset intermediary trading services" as provided from the Respondent's websites. Moreover, the RS GOLD and RS OLD SCHOOL trademarks were registered much later than the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names are not confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. (i) The disputed domain name <rsorder.com> is completely different from RUNESCAPE. The only overlap is in the letters "r" and "s" which, as a two-letter combination, have infinite ambiguity. This disputed domain name also contains the word "order", unlike the trademark RS, which has little distinctiveness. (ii) In the disputed domain name <rsgoldfast.com>, "rs" only serves as a qualifier, indicating the game ecosystem to which the gold coins belong; "gold" and "fast" are both common English words. This disputed domain name also contains the word "fast", unlike the trademark RS GOLD. This disputed domain name conveys to users the meaning "RuneScape game gold fast delivery service", which constitutes a nominative fair use of "RS". RS and RS GOLD are not registered trademarks in China.

The First Respondent has rights and legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names <rsorder.com> and <rsgoldfast.com>. (i) The First Respondent entered into a licensing agreement with Whisper Games Limited, which operates the trading websites associated with the disputed domain names and is responsible for all content. The terms of the agreement show that the First Respondent has exercised reasonable care in good faith. After receiving notice of the Complaint, the Respondent visited the websites and noted that neither currently contains any elements infringing upon the Complainant's rights, and a disclaimer is prominently displayed. The third-party service provider is using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of a service. (ii) The websites' design is different from that of the Complainant's official website; the icons resemble those in the Complainant's game because they point to the same in-game items. (iii) The websites have never been used for illegal activities. Violation of the real-world trading clause in the Complainant's end user license agreement is not illegal in a public law sense. The Complainant has not shown that the First Respondent is a party to that license agreement. The Complainant's own RS Bonds system is the official channel for purchasing in-game currency with real money. Virtual currency has objective economic value and trading in it with real money is not an unfair business model. (iv) The First Respondent's websites do not, for example, reproduce copyrighted images, imitate the appearance of the Complainant's official page, redirect traffic to competitor game websites, or lack disclaimers. (v) Dispute over issues such as infringement upon competitive interests are outside the scope of the UDRP; the Complainant should file a separate lawsuit. (vi) The First Respondent complies with the criteria set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). He has been continuously operating websites in connection with his disputed domain names since 2008 and 2013, and is not a domainer. He can still enjoy a legitimate interest in descriptive domain names containing third party trademarks.

The disputed domain names <rsorder.com> and <rsgoldfast.com> were not registered and are not being used in bad faith. (i) The trademark RS GOLD was registered long after these disputed domain names. The Complainant's trademarks are not registered in China. (ii) The First Respondent initially registered his disputed domain names for the purpose of engaging in an online flower business, abbreviating the English word "rose" to "rs", so that "rsorder" meant "flower orders", and "rsgoldfast" meant "rose", "gold", and "fast", implying that the flowers were of gold quality and delivered quickly. The Complainant's own social media evidence shows "RuneScape (RS)" - which demonstrates that "RS" is not an independent trademark, but rather a colloquial abbreviation of RuneScape. (iii) The First Respondent has never made an offer to sell the disputed domain names; never registered variants of other trademarks owned by the Complainant; never redirected traffic to competing websites; and never engaged in any bad faith conduct listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. (iv) The Parties are not competitors. The Complainant issues new gold coins to players as bonds; the Respondent's website provides a secondary service for the transfer of existing virtual assets such as gold coins between players. The First Respondent registered only two disputed domain names over a period of approximately 5 years, and the associated websites never engaged in impersonation or fraud.

The Respondent requests the Panel to examine whether the Complainant has engaged in reverse domain name hijacking. The Complainant used a 2023 trademark registration to attack a 2008 domain name registration, and knowingly conflated legitimate secondary market intermediary services with illegal activities such as piracy and fraud, abusing the UDRP procedure to enforce its internal end user license agreement terms.

C. Second Respondent

The Second Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name <rsmalls.com>.

The disputed domain name <rsmalls.com> was registered in 2013, years before the Complainant's trademarks RS GOLD, RS OLD SCHOOL, and OSRS. This disputed domain name is composed of "rs" - a generic abbreviation lacking distinctiveness - and "malls" - a completely generic descriptive term. The combination of the two letters "rs" has numerous meanings in everyday use, such as Real State, Remote Sensing, and RStudio, and it does not possess an exclusive meaning. The Second Respondent's use of "rsmalls" in its domain name constitutes an independent mark with its own commercial meaning, and its association with the Complainant's trademark has been extremely diluted, and is thus not confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Second Respondent enjoys rights and legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name <rsmalls.com>. The Second Respondent has long leased it to a third party for use in connection with the bona fide provision of virtual item trading services. Breach of a game company's internal user agreement is not equivalent to violating national laws. Virtual asset trading intermediary services are a legitimate business model and the Second Respondent operates a legitimate secondary market trading platform. The Complainant's terms of service are part of a contract unilaterally drafted and limited in effect to contracting users (i.e., individual game players). This dispute is a case about breach of contract and does not fall within the scope of the UDRP, which is specifically designed for cybersquatting.

The disputed domain name <rsmalls.com> was not registered in bad faith. It was chosen by the Second Respondent, a computer programmer, due to the R programming language; "RS" was an abbreviation of "RStudio" (an integrated development environment designed for the R programming language). The disputed domain name was originally intended for an R language-related code marketplace. Due to the decline in R's popularity, this project failed to launch. The Second Respondent chose to lease the disputed domain name to a third party so as not to waste network assets. The Complainant's RS trademark is not registered in China, and the Respondent, as a Chinese resident, had no way of knowing about it. The Respondent has operated the associated website openly and transparently for over a decade. The Complainant's long delay in bringing an UDRP action demonstrates that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name did not constitute bad faith as defined under the UDRP policy.

The disputed domain name <rsmalls.com> has not been used in bad faith. It points to a trading platform but the Respondent merely leases the disputed domain name to Whisper Games Limited and does not participate in its operation. The trading platform sells virtual items related to RuneScape and Old School RuneScape but the use of in-game items and terminology is solely for the purpose of accurately describing the nature and origin of the goods sold to consumers. This is legitimate fair use and not intended to impersonate the Complainant's official entity. The service contract signed between the Second Respondent and the independent third-party service provider explicitly included compliance clauses to refrain from intellectual property infringement. The Second Respondent has fulfilled its reasonable duty of care and management. After receiving the Complaint, the Second Respondent also visited the website and found that the homepage displayed a prominent disclaimer and the page was clearly different from the Complainant's website. The Complainant itself has characterized this dispute as a substantive legal dispute raising issues of trademark infringement, breach of contract, and copyright infringement, rather than the bad faith cybersquatting addressed by the UDRP. The core issue in a UDRP dispute is whether a domain name's registration and use are in bad faith, not whether the content of the associated website constitutes trademark infringement or is otherwise illegal.

The Complainant's attempt to suppress legitimate third-party virtual goods marketplaces through this process constitutes an abuse of the UDRP. The disputed domain name was registered prior to the complainant's registration of several core trademarks, and the respondent used the disputed domain name in good faith for legitimate business purposes, without any malicious intent to impersonate or defraud. The respondent, as an independent third-party platform providing services, is engaging in free market competition. Therefore, the respondent respectfully requests the panel to dismiss all of the Complainant's claims.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The First Respondent confirms that it holds two disputed domain names (i.e., <rsorder.com> and <rgoldfast.com>) but the other disputed domain name (i.e., <small.com>) is registered in the name of the Second Respondent. The Respondents file separate Responses to which they annex their respective Chinese national identification cards. The Respondents deny that they are under common control and object to consolidation of the Complaint regarding their respective disputed domain names.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names follow a pattern insofar as they each incorporate the letters "rs" as their initial element, followed by one or two English words and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension ".com". The associated websites are put to the same use (i.e., selling in-game currency for the same games) and are purportedly operated by the same company (i.e., Whisper Games Limited) under leases from both Respondents, when that company's sole director is the First Respondent. These circumstances indicate coordinated action between the Respondents. Further, after receiving notice of the dispute, disclaimers were added to the homepages of the websites associated with all three disputed domain names in the same format. The Response filed by the Second Respondent seems to have been used as the basis for the Response filed by the First Respondent, as a draft version of the latter was submitted in mark-up. Accordingly, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the disputed domain names and associated websites are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The claims raise many of the same issues. Nor does consolidation of the legal disputes lead to any technical confusion between Chinese and English naming protocols.

Therefore, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (each referred to below as "the Respondent", except as otherwise indicated) in a single proceeding.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <rsmalls.com> is Chinese, but the language of the Registration Agreements for the other two disputed domain names is English. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English and the Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English. Its main reasons are that the disputed domain names include Latin characters as opposed to Chinese characters, and the associated websites are also in English, offering products for purchase in GBP, and listing a United Kingdom registered company as their operator, which supports the view that the Respondent understands, or is at least competent, in the English language.

The Responses were filed in Chinese. As regards the disputed domain name <rsmalls.com>, the Second Respondent requested that the language of the proceeding be Chinese. He notes that Chinese is the language of the Registration Agreement for his disputed domain name and states that he is not proficient enough in English to present a legal defense in English. As regards the other two disputed domain names, the First Respondent requests that the Panel accept the Response in Chinese so that he has a fair opportunity to present his case, and declares that he is not proficient enough in English to present a legal defense in English.

The Panel notes the detailed content of the Responses which shows that the Respondent has in fact understood the content of the Complaint, and had a fair opportunity to present his case.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreements, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the Parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English but that the Panel will accept all submissions as filed in their original language, whether English or Chinese, without translation.

C. Unsolicited Supplemental Filing

The Complainant made an unsolicited supplemental filing on July 31, 2026. On the next business day (August 3, 2026), the First Respondent sought confirmation from the Center as to whether the supplemental filing was solicited, whether it formed part of the case file, and whether he was required to reply to it. On the same day, the Center acknowledged receipt of both communications, confirming that the Complainant's supplemental filing was unsolicited and that it was in the Panel's sole discretion whether to consider and/or admit any supplemental filing from either party and whether to order further procedural steps.

The Complainant asks the Panel to admit its supplemental filing on the basis that it addresses new categories of information that were not available at the time of filing the Complaint, specifically, the request for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking, the disclosure of lease agreements regarding the disputed domain names, and recent changes in the associated websites.

Paragraph 10(b) of the Rules requires the Panel, in all cases, to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case. Paragraph 10(c) of the Rules requires the Panel to ensure that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition. Paragraph 10(d) of the Rules also provides that "[t]he Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence". While paragraph 12 of the Rules does not preclude the Panel from accepting unsolicited filings, these are generally discouraged. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.6.

The Panel observes that the Complainant's supplemental filing was received one week after the appointment of the Panel and over three weeks after the filing of the Responses. The supplemental filing addresses every procedural and substantive issue in the dispute, seeks to add a co-respondent, and includes multiple annexes. Yet the Panel sees nothing in the supplemental filing that needs to be taken into account to enable the Panel to assess the Respondent's assertions and evidence. Therefore, the Panel declines to accept the Complainant's supplemental filing as part of the record of this proceeding. Accordingly, there is no need to provide the Respondent an opportunity to reply to it.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark 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.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of an RS trademark and an RS GOLD trademark, among others, for the purposes of the Policy. Those rights were valid at the time when the Complaint was filed, which is sufficient for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.1.3 and 1.2.1.

The Respondent submits that the RS and RS GOLD trademarks are not registered in China and that the registrations do not specify the services that the Respondent provides. However, the Panel notes the global nature of the Internet and Domain Name System, and recalls that the jurisdictions where the Complainant's trademarks are valid are not considered relevant to the assessment under the first element of the Policy. The services for which the marks are registered are not considered relevant to the first element either. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.2.

The Panel finds that the RS mark is recognizable within all three disputed domain names, and the RS GOLD mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name <rsgoldfast.com>. Despite the addition of other words (variously, "order", "gold", "fast", and "malls"), the RS mark remains recognizable within each disputed domain name, and despite the addition of the word "fast", the RS GOLD mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name <rsgoldfast.com>. The only other element in each disputed domain name is a gTLD extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

The Respondent submits that the RS mark lacks distinctiveness and has many potential meanings, such that its combination with other terms in the disputed domain names dilutes its association with the Complainant and is thus not confusingly similar. However, the Panel finds the RS mark recognizable within each disputed domain name. The Panel also notes the content of the websites associated with the disputed domain names, where it appears *prima facie* that the Respondent seeks to target the

Complainant's RS and RS GOLD marks, which confirms a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.15.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain names combine the RS mark and, in one case, the RS GOLD mark, with descriptive terms, which risks implying to RS players that they will resolve to websites where they can order purchases for the RuneScape game, or obtain fast service for RS Gold (the RuneScape in-game currency), or find online malls to shop for RuneScape, respectively. The disputed domain names resolve to websites that use the letters RS in their titles, one of which prominently displays the letters RS in a logo, and one of which also uses the RS GOLD mark in its title. The content displays the Complainant's RS and OSRS marks, and offer for sale in-game currency and, in two cases, items for the Complainant's RuneScape and Old School RuneScape games. The websites may give the impression that they are affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant when, in fact, the Respondent does not have any authorization from the Complainant to use its marks. At the time when the Complaint was filed, the websites did not display a reasonably clear or prominent disclaimer clarifying their lack of relationship with the Complainant; the website associated with the disputed domain name <rsgoldfast.com> displayed a vaguely worded and inconspicuous disclaimer while the others displayed none. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor is he making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Further, the Respondent is identified by the names "Wang Yuzhu", "Wang Yulong", and "Wang Yuhua", and by the organization name "yidawangluo", none of which resembles any of the disputed domain names. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

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 respect of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent submits that the websites associated with the disputed domain names are operated by Whisper Games Limited, which is responsible for all content. However, as the registrant, the Respondent remains responsible for the use to which the disputed domain names are put. Lease agreements with a third party do not discharge the Respondent's responsibility under the Policy, particularly in this case where the Respondent is the sole director and sole person with significant control of the alleged operating company, and that company is ostensibly dormant.

The Respondent argues that he is making a legitimate fair use of the Complainant's in-game elements and terminology solely for the purpose of accurately describing the nature and origin of the goods sold to consumers, and that this is not intended to impersonate the Complainant's official entity. However, the websites may give the false impression that they are affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. The Respondent presents screenshots, all of which now display a disclaimer. The disclaimers on the homepages are unambiguous and displayed on a ribbon of contrasting color in a prominent position above the website titles, but they are all in small type, while the legal disclaimers in the terms and conditions are not visible on the homepages. In any case, it appears that these disclaimers were added only after the Respondent received notice of this dispute; there is no evidence that they were displayed at the time when the Complaint was filed.

The Respondent also argues that "RS" is a two-letter combination with numerous meanings in everyday use, such as Real State, Remote Sensing, and RStudio. However, even if these were accepted meanings of "RS", the Respondent does not use that combination in any such sense; rather, he uses "RS" in the disputed domain names and on the associated websites as a reference to the Complainant's RuneScape game.

In sum, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing.

Based on the record, 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. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location."

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in 2008 and 2013, after the registration of the Complainant's RS mark in 2007. Registration may still be in bad faith even though one disputed domain name also incorporates the RS GOLD trademark, which was not registered until later. RS is the subject of an independent trademark registration, even though it forms part of other marks as well. Each of the disputed domain names incorporates the RS mark as its initial element, combining it with descriptive terms. The associated websites prominently display the Complainant's RS and OSRS marks, and offer for sale in-game currency and, in two cases, items for the Complainant's RuneScape and Old School RuneScape games. The Respondent claims that, as a Chinese resident, he had no way of knowing about the RS trademark. However, his alternative explanations for the registration of the disputed domain names are not plausible. He asserts that "rs" was intended as a reference to roses in two disputed domain names and to RStudio, an integrated development environment for the R programming language, in the other disputed domain name, but nothing indicates that "rs" is a known abbreviation for roses or for RStudio. In any case, there is no evidence that the disputed domain names were ever used in either sense, whereas they are all used to refer to RuneScape. One of the websites highlights that it has been used to sell RuneScape in-game currency since 2008, the earliest date of registration. In view of all these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant's RS mark in mind.

As regards use, the disputed domain names are intended to attract Internet users searching for the Complainant's RS (RuneScape) game, in-game currency and in-game items, diverting them to the Respondent's websites. Regardless of whether players trade the Respondent's virtual assets in the same

way as the Complainant's in-game currency, the disputed domain names appear intended to divert their traffic from the Complainant's website. These circumstances indicate that the case falls within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent argues that he registered only two disputed domain names over a period of approximately five years, and the associated websites never engaged in impersonation or fraud. However, the Policy provides a remedy where even a single disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and the associated websites may give a false impression regarding the affiliation or endorsement of themselves or the in-game currency and in-game items that they offer for sale. The disclaimers currently displayed are inadequate and were added only after receipt of notice of this dispute.

Further, the Respondent sought to avoid responsibility for the use of the disputed domain names by submitting two agreements leasing them to an operating company named Whisper Games Limited. The agreements were purportedly executed under company seal in 2022 and 2020 but the company was not incorporated until 2023. The seal was affixed without attestation signatures. The Respondent's websites identify Whisper Games Limited as their operating company but it files its accounts as a dormant company. The Respondent failed to mention that the First Respondent is the sole director and sole person with significant control of that company. These circumstances indicate that the lease agreements are merely pretextual to avoid the application of the Policy, which is a further indication of bad faith.

The Respondent argues that it has openly used the disputed domain names with its websites for years and that the Complainant has delayed taking action. However, the Complainant has neither consented to the registration and use of the disputed domain names, nor waived its rights under the Policy. Mere delay neither bars a complainant from filing a case under the Policy, nor from potentially prevailing on the merits. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.17.

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

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

The Respondent asks the Panel to make or consider a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

The Panel does not find that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith or that it constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. On the contrary, the Panel has upheld the Complaint.

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 <rsgoldfast.com>, <rsmalls.com>, and <rsorder.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: August 3, 2026