ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Jagex Limited v. Mykolas Ramanauskas, ZAP IT UP LIMITED
Case No. D2026-2445

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Mykolas Ramanauskas, ZAP IT UP LIMITED, Lithuania (collectively as the "Respondent"), self-represented. [1]

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <ezosrs.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB.

The disputed domain names <ezrsaccounts.com> and <osrsaccount.com> are registered with Name.com, Inc. The disputed domain name <ezrsgold.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 5, 2026. On June 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 5, June 7, and June 8, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses 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 9, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 12, 2026.

[1] The registrars' verification discloses Lithuania for the registrant's country of three registrations of the disputed domain name and the United Kingdom for <ezosrs.com>.

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 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 7, 2026. The Respondent sent an informal communication on June 26, 2026, in which he expressed interest in exploring an amicable resolution of this matter. The proceeding was suspended on July 3, 2026, to explore settlement discussions. The suspension period was subsequently extended at the Complainant's request. Following the Complainant's request for reinstitution, the proceeding was reinstituted on September 30, 2026. Upon reinstitution, the new due date for the Response was October 4, 2026. On October 5, 2026, the Respondent requested permission to submit a late Response. On October 13, 2026, the Center extended the Response due date to October 17, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on October 15, 2026.

On October 16, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment. The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on October 21, 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 a United Kingdom company engaged in the development, publication, and operation of online video games. The Complainant is known particularly for its massively multiplayer online role-playing games RuneScape and Old School RuneScape, the latter of which is commonly referred to as "OSRS".

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for marks associated with its games, including 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 UK00003478102 for OSRS, registered on August 9, 2020; and United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00003710504 for RS GOLD, registered on November 10, 2023. These registrations cover, among other goods and services, electronic games and entertainment-related offerings.

The disputed domain names were created on the following dates:

- <ezrsgold.com>: May 27, 2016;
- <osrsaccount.com>: January 21, 2020;
- <ezrsaccounts.com>: January 27, 2020; and
- <ezosrs.com>: January 20, 2023.

The Respondent is associated with Zap It Up Limited, a United Kingdom company. The disputed domain names have been used in connection with websites offering accounts, virtual currency, in-game items, and related services for the Complainant's games. The evidence includes screenshots showing listings for these offerings, including associated prices and purchasing options. The disputed domain name <osrsaccount.com> has redirected Internet users to the website at <ezrsaccounts.com>.

The Complainant's published game rules prohibit certain transactions involving the sale of in-game currency, accounts, and items for real-world value, commonly referred to as "real-world trading".

The website at <ezrsgold.com> has displayed a disclaimer identifying Jagex as the owner of the RUNESCAPE trademark and stating that the website is not affiliated with the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent disputes the Complainant's allegations and denies that the disputed domain names or the websites to which they resolve misrepresent any relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent contends that Internet users would not reasonably believe that the websites are operated, sponsored, or endorsed by the Complainant. The Respondent points to a disclaimer appearing on the website at <ezrsgold.com>, which expressly identifies the Complainant as the owner of the RUNESCAPE mark and states that the website is not affiliated with the Complainant.

The Respondent further asserts that, although certain websites remain accessible, they are no longer functioning and do not provide services or transaction capabilities. The Respondent also notes that the disputed domain names were registered at different times and argues that their individual registration histories should be considered separately. The Respondent states that <osrsaccount.com> redirected to <ezrsaccounts.com> rather than operating as a separate website.

The Respondent has expressed a willingness to transfer the disputed domain names to the Complainant, but only pursuant to a negotiated settlement that includes, among other things, a mutual release of claims and no admission of wrongdoing. The Respondent expressly states that this proposal does not constitute unconditional consent to transfer the disputed domain names.

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes concerning the four disputed domain names pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

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 considering a request to consolidate multiple respondents, panels look at whether the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and whether 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.

The record supports consolidation. The Registrars disclosed the same individual, Mykolas Ramanauskas, as the registrant of all four disputed domain names. Two of the registrations also identify Zap It Up Limited as the registrant organization. The registrations share contact information, including the same telephone number and overlapping email addresses. The websites associated with the disputed domain names also share similar content and branding, and <osrsaccount.com> redirects to <ezrsaccounts.com>.

The Respondent has submitted a single Response addressing all four disputed domain names. Although the Respondent argues that the individual registration histories and circumstances should be considered separately, the Respondent does not dispute that the disputed domain names are under common control. The Panel agrees that the individual circumstances should be considered as appropriate in evaluating the merits, but this does not weigh against consolidation.

Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are under common control and that consolidation would be fair and equitable to the Parties. Accordingly, the Panel grants the Complainant's request for consolidation and refers to the nominally different registrants collectively as the "Respondent".

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to that mark. This element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. D2014-0657. The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the RS and OSRS marks by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain names <ezrsgold.com> and <ezrsaccounts.com> incorporate the RS mark in its entirety. The disputed domain names <ezosrs.com> and <osrsaccount.com> incorporate the OSRS mark in its entirety. The addition of the terms "ez", "gold", "accounts", and "account" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's marks. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8. The Complainant's marks remain recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

The ".com" extension is disregarded for purposes of this comparison. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Respondent has not received permission from the Complainant to use its trademarks, (2) the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain names, and (3) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to operate commercial websites offering for sale in-game currency, items, and accounts associated with the Complainant's games. The Complainant asserts that these activities violate its rules governing the games and that the Respondent has used the Complainant's marks and game imagery to attract customers to its websites.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented sufficient evidence to overcome this showing. Although the Respondent denies that the websites misrepresent any affiliation with the Complainant and points to a disclaimer on the website at the disputed domain name <ezrsgold.com>, the existence of a disclaimer in the footer of one website does not, in the circumstances of this case, establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to attract Internet users to commercial websites offering products and services associated with the Complainant's games. The Respondent has not demonstrated that this use constitutes a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate fair use. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 2.5 and 2.8.

The Respondent's assertion that the websites are no longer functioning does not establish that their previous use was legitimate. Nor is it necessary for the Panel to determine whether the Respondent's activities independently violated the Complainant's contractual rules or applicable copyright law. The question under the Policy is whether the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. On the record presented, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not overcome the Complainant's prima facie showing, and nothing else in the record supports a finding in the Respondent's favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Policy describes several non-exhaustive circumstances demonstrating a respondent's bad faith registration and use. Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, a panel may find bad faith when a respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or the products or services offered there.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks. The Complainant has established rights in the RUNESCAPE and RS marks dating from 2002 and 2007, respectively, well before the registration of any of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names combine the Complainant's marks, or abbreviations associated with its games, with terms such as "gold" and "accounts", which relate directly to the Complainant's games and the products offered through the Respondent's websites. The Panel finds that the Respondent deliberately selected the disputed domain names to target the Complainant and its business.

The Panel has considered the registration dates of the individual disputed domain names, including the fact that <osrsaccount.com> was registered on January 21, 2020, before the Complainant obtained its August 2020 registration for the OSRS mark. The registration of <ezrsgold.com> in 2016 likewise predates the Complainant's 2023 registration for the RS GOLD mark. Under section 3.8.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, a domain name registered before a complainant acquired trademark rights will not normally be considered to have been registered in bad faith.

These circumstances do not prevent a finding of bad faith registration in this case. The Complainant's earlier rights in the RUNESCAPE and RS marks predate all four disputed domain names. Moreover, the Complainant's Old School RuneScape game had been available since 2013, well before the registration of <osrsaccount.com>. The composition of that disputed domain name, incorporating the abbreviation "OSRS" together with the term "account", demonstrates that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant's existing game and the goodwill associated with it. The Respondent's use of that disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to <ezrsaccounts.com> further supports this conclusion. The Panel's finding does not depend on treating the later registration of the OSRS mark as establishing trademark rights at the time <osrsaccount.com> was registered.

Similarly, although the RS GOLD mark was registered after <ezrsgold.com>, the Complainant's earlier RS mark was already registered, and the combination of that mark with the term "gold" directly refers to the

in-game currency associated with the Complainant's games. The Panel finds that the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain names was intended to take advantage of the Complainant's existing trademark rights and goodwill.

The evidence also establishes bad faith use. The Respondent has used the disputed domain names to attract Internet users to commercial websites offering in-game currency, items, and accounts associated with the Complainant's games. The websites have incorporated imagery and other elements associated with those games. The Panel finds that the Respondent has sought to take commercial advantage of the recognition of the Complainant's marks by attracting Internet users to websites offering products and services associated with the Complainant's games. Such conduct constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent's arguments do not change this conclusion. Although the website at <ezrsgold.com> contains a disclaimer of affiliation with the Complainant, that disclaimer does not overcome the evidence that the Respondent has used the Complainant's marks in the disputed domain names to attract Internet users for commercial gain. Nor does the Respondent's assertion that the websites are no longer functioning negate the evidence of their previous commercial use. The Respondent's observation that the disputed domain names were registered at different times has been taken into account, but the circumstances of their registration and use support a finding of bad faith as to each of them.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 <ezosrs.com>, <ezrsaccounts.com>, <ezrsgold.com> and <osrsaccount.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/
Evan D. Brown
Sole Panelist
Date: November 4, 2026