

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jagex Limited v. RSGM Sales, RSGM Sales LLC
Case No. D2026-2451

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is RSGM Sales, RSGM Sales LLC, United States of America, represented by Mr. Franklin BV, Belgium.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <runescapegoldmarkt.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the "Registrar").

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 Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 6, 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 12, 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 5, 2026. The Respondent requested the four calendar days to submit its response. On July 2, 2026, the Center granted the automatic four calendar day extension for response under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. The Response was filed with the Center on July 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on July 20, 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 company incorporated in the United Kingdom in 2000. It develops, publishes and operates online video games, including the massive multiplayer online role-playing games (“MMORPGs”) “RuneScape” and “Old School RuneScape”. According to the evidence, the Complainant has operated the domain name <runescape.com> since at least August 2000 and owns numerous domain names incorporating the RUNESCAPE mark.

The Complainant owns an international trademark portfolio for the RUNESCAPE marks covering multiple jurisdictions, including but not limited to United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00002302308 for the mark RUNESCAPE, registered on December 27, 2002, and European Union Trademark Registration No. 018433911 for the mark RUNESCAPE registered on August 28, 2021. The Panel notes that the Complainant’s RUNESCAPE marks have been recognized as famous or well-known in the gaming sector by prior panels applying the Policy, see for instance: *Jagex Limited v. Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc / Nazfezer Terrazik*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2075](#).

The disputed domain name <runescapegoldmarkt.com> was registered on April 8, 2014. It resolves to a commercial website promoting and facilitating the purchase and sale of virtual currency for the Complainant’s RuneScape and Old School RuneScape games. The website contains extensive references to the Complainant’s games and offers services relating to in-game currency (named “gold”) for those games. The record further shows that the website uses the term “RuneScape” throughout its content and displays information directed at players of the Complainant’s games. According to the Respondent, it does not itself own, hold, transfer or sell any of the virtual currency, but merely facilitates transactions which take place between buyers and sellers.

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 confusingly similar to its RUNESCAPE trademark because it incorporates that mark in its entirety, with the addition of the terms “gold” and “markt”, which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further submits that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant while being used for a commercial website offering services relating to the Complainant’s RuneScape and Old School RuneScape games.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that its RUNESCAPE trademark long predates the registration of the disputed domain name and had acquired a substantial reputation by that time. According to the Complainant, the Respondent deliberately selected the disputed domain name to target the Complainant and its games, as evidenced by the incorporation of the RUNESCAPE trademark in the disputed domain name,

the extensive use of the Complainant's trademarks and game-related content on the associated website, and the offering of virtual in-game currency and related services connected with the Complainant's games. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is intentionally attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name and the associated website.

B. Respondent

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

The Respondent particularly submits that the disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks in the manner alleged. While acknowledging that the disputed domain name contains the term "runescape", the Respondent argues that the Complaint improperly relies on the Complainant's later-filed RS GOLD trademarks, which postdate the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. According to the Respondent, the additional terms in the disputed domain name refer to a marketplace for the trading of virtual currency and do not give rise to the confusion alleged by the Complainant.

The Respondent further submits that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because it operates a bona fide online marketplace facilitating transactions between players involving existing in-game currency, rather than selling virtual currency itself or competing with the Complainant's business. The Respondent contends that the disputed domain name accurately describes the nature of its services, that the website clearly identifies its operator as "RSGM Sales LLC", and that it contains a disclaimer stating that it is not affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent also disputes the Complainant's characterization of its activities as unlawful, arguing that any alleged breach of the Complainant's contractual terms does not establish a lack of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

The Respondent finally submits that the disputed domain name was neither registered nor is being used in bad faith. It argues that the Complainant has failed to prove bad faith at the time of registration in April 2014, relying instead on trademark registrations, contractual terms, and game rules that came into existence years later. The Respondent further contends that the Complainant has not established that the Respondent intended to disrupt the Complainant's business or to compete with the Complainant, maintaining that it merely facilitates transactions between users of existing virtual currency rather than offering competing products or services. Accordingly, the Respondent submits that the Complaint should be denied.

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 entirety of the RUNESCAPE mark is reproduced 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](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “gold” and “mark”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is not necessary for the Panel to address the allegations regarding the confusing similarity between the Complainant’s mark RS GOLD and the disputed domain name under the circumstances of the case.

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.

As a preliminary matter, the Panel notes that parties disagree as to the applicability, interpretation and binding nature of the Complainant’s Terms and Conditions (“T&Cs”), End User License Agreement (“EULA”), and in-game rules and as to the legal implications and legality of the Respondent’s activities in light of those rules. The Complainant particularly advances a number of arguments contending that the Respondent’s breaches of the abovementioned rules demonstrate that the Respondent is not conducting a bona fide business and is engaged in unlawful activities.

Having reviewed the Parties’ submissions and the website associated with the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that the Respondent operates an intermediary platform through which players may buy and sell RuneScape in-game currency. However, whether or not such activities are consistent with the Complainant’s contractual terms or otherwise lawful under the Complainant’s rules raises complex issues of contract law (including, but not limited to, the disputed acceptance of these terms by the Respondent, their application and their interpretation) and other legal issues that extend well beyond the limited scope of the present administrative proceedings under the Policy.

The Panel considers it is neither required nor is it appropriate for the Panel to determine such allegations regarding such contractual issues for the purpose of deciding this dispute and therefore declines to make a finding on them. The Panel considers that the above-mentioned rules lack relevance to UDRP. See *Meta Platforms, Inc v. Brad Dassow, Custom By Design LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4716](#). Instead, the Panel confines its assessment to whether the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy solely.

Firstly, the Panel notes that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its RUNESCAPE trademark or to register a domain name incorporating a variation of that trademark. The Panel also finds that there is no evidence that the Respondent is licensed by, affiliated with, or otherwise has any relationship with the Complainant or that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not disputed that the Respondent is making clear commercial use of the disputed domain name and the Respondent can therefore not rely on paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy concerning legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The core of the dispute is therefore whether the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In this regard, the Complainant essentially contends that the Respondent’s activities violate the Complainant’s Terms and Conditions, EULA and in-game Rules, compete with the Complainant’s own RuneScape Bonds offering, and unlawfully exploit the goodwill associated with the Complainant’s trademarks for commercial gain.

The Respondent, in turn, submits that it has rights or legitimate interests because it operates a bona fide intermediary platform through which independent players buy and sell existing RuneScape in-game currency, without the Respondent itself owning, selling or delivering that currency. The Respondent further contends that it is not engaged in any unlawful activity, is not competing with the Complainant, that the

website clearly identifies its operator as RSGM Sales LLC, and that the disputed domain name describes an independent marketplace rather than suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant.

As to the Complainant's set of arguments regarding implied affiliation, the Panel is of the view that the disputed domain name by itself does not necessarily create an implied affiliation with the Complainant. One can argue that the addition of the term "markt", which means "market" in both German and Dutch and can be understandable by English speakers as a public market, is defined by the Merriam-Webster Dictionary¹ as "a public place where a market is held". One can argue that it suggesting a public marketplace in which third parties trade rather than necessarily as an official sales channel operated by the Complainant. In the Panel's view, Internet users could also understand the disputed domain name as referring to a platform or marketplace for RuneScape-related in-game currency ("gold"), with the presence of third party vendor(s), not necessarily just an official website operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.

In assessing the impact of the additional term(s), where the term does not give a clear signal that creates a distinction between the respondent's domain name and the complainant's mark, panels would undertake a more robust "holistic" assessment of the factors. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. As noted in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.2, panels also consider the overall facts and circumstances of the case, including whether it is clear to Internet users visiting the respondent's website that the website is not operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the complainant. Relevant considerations may include the nature and genuineness of the respondent's activities, whether the respondent's conduct forms part of a broader pattern of bona fide activity, and whether the absence of affiliation is apparent from the website's content, presentation, or a reasonably clear and prominent disclaimer.

The Panel has also considered whether the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name could give rise to rights or legitimate interests by analogy to the principles set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). The Panel finds that, even if those principles are applied by analogy to the Respondent's intermediary platform (since the Respondent is, as the Respondent concedes, facilitating transactions between independent players rather than selling the in-game currency itself), the Panel finds that the Respondent cannot avail itself of those principles in the circumstances of this case. Notably, the Panel considers, upon review of the website at the disputed domain name, that this website does not prominently disclose the absence of any relationship with the Complainant. While the footer only discreetly identifies the operator as "RSGM Sales LLC", this appears only in small, inconspicuous text. Given the association of "RS" with the Complainant's RUNESCAPE game, Internet users may not readily understand from the reference to "RSGM Sales LLC" alone that the website is operated by an entity wholly independent of the Complainant. While the Respondent's Terms and Conditions (Annex 2 to the Response) contain a statement that the website has no affiliation with the Complainant, that statement appears only within the definitions section of the Terms and Conditions. The website does not clearly state that it is independent of, or unaffiliated with, the Complainant, which it could have in very prominent ways, and would be required if the Respondent genuinely wished to avoid any potential confusion as to its relationship with the Complainant.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has failed to rebut that case. The Respondent could have clearly and prominently disclosed that it is independent of, or unaffiliated with, the Complainant. For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

¹ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/market>

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 registered a domain name which incorporates the Complainant's well-known RUNESCAPE trademark in its entirety together with the terms "gold" and "markt", the latter two terms referring to a marketplace facilitating the trading of RuneScape in-game currency. The Panel further notes that the Respondent concedes that the disputed domain name was selected to identify its platform for facilitating transactions in RuneScape in-game currency. The Panel further notes that the Complainant's trademark registrations long predate the registration of the disputed domain name on April 8, 2014. In the Panel's view, the composition of the disputed domain name and the manner in which it has been used leave no doubt that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant and its RUNESCAPE trademark through its registration of the disputed domain name. In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its prior trademark rights, and the Panel therefore accepts that the disputed domain name was registered 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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for commercial gain in connection with its intermediary platform facilitating transactions in RuneScape and Old School RuneScape in-game currency. By adopting the Complainant's well-known trademark prominently in the disputed domain name, the Respondent appropriated the goodwill embodied in the Complainant's RUNESCAPE trademark in order to attract Internet users seeking services relating to the Complainant's games. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's RUNESCAPE trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name and the services offered thereon. The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent's conduct falls within the circumstances of bad faith registration and use contemplated by paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <runescapegoldmarkt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: August 3, 2026