

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

IDJWorld d.o.o. v. Marko Milovanović (Marko Milovanovic)
Case No. D2026-2487

1. The Parties

The Complainant is IDJWorld d.o.o., Serbia, represented by Tria Partners, Serbia.

The Respondent is Marko Milovanović (Marko Milovanovic), Serbia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <idjvideos.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 9, 2026. On June 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 10, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 12, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on July 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Stefan Bojovic as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 Serbian company active in the fields of the music industry, publishing, digital media, and video content, operating under the “IDJ” and “IDJ Videos” brands both in Serbia and internationally.

The Complainant has been operating in its current corporate form since 2016. However, it has been active on the Serbian market operating under, inter alia, “IDJVideos” brand since 2011, including through traditional media, digital media, and social media platforms. The Complainant’s YouTube channel has more than 8.3 billion views and has more than 4 million subscribers. Since 2017, the Complainant has been doing business within the umbrella of the international media and telecom conglomerate, “United Group” and its principal media hub (including TV and radio streaming of its media assets) is located at the website [“https://idjtv.nova.rs/”](https://idjtv.nova.rs/).

The Complainant is the owner of the IDJ VIDEOS trademark which is protected by trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including the following:

- Serbian trademark registration No. 78927 for IDJ VIDEOS (word/device), registered on June 30, 2020;
- International trademark registration No. 1513579 for IDJ VIDEOS (word/device), registered on January 14, 2020;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00801513579 for IDJ VIDEOS (word/device), registered on June 30, 2020.

The Complainant also owns a broad family of trademarks centered on the dominant element “IDJ”, including, inter alia, “IDJDigital”, “IDJTunes”, “IDJTV”, and “IDJKids”.

In addition, the Complainant also owns various domain name registrations reflecting its IDJ VIDEOS trademark, such as <idjvideos.tv> registered on September 26, 2012.

The Respondent is an individual from Serbia, active in the field of video production, graphic design and related creative services, operating under the commercial identifiers “Junior Produkcija” and “Marko X Junior”. The Respondent states that the element “Junior” has formed a genuine and continuous part of the Respondent’s professional identity for a number of years, across his websites, social media presence, logos and promotional materials.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 23, 2022, and it currently resolves to a page with the message “Sajt nije u funkciji” (“Website is not operational” in Serbian). However, based on the evidence provided by the Complainant, in April 2026, the disputed domain name used to resolve to the web presentation of “Junior Produkcija”.

Before initiating present proceeding, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on April 20, 2026, requesting, inter alia, cessation of further use of the disputed domain name and its transfer to the Complainant. Based on the parties’ submissions, it seems that the Respondent agreed to cease the use of the disputed domain name, but has refused to transfer it to the Complainant, indicating that it could only be effected on mutually acceptable terms.

Following the Parties’ communications, the disputed domain name ceased to resolve to the web presentation of “Junior Produkcija”, and as claimed by the Complainant (which the Respondent did not dispute), the Respondent transferred the “Junior Produkcija” website to the other domain name <juniorprodukcija.com>, registered on April 22, 2026.

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 its IDJ VIDEOS trademark is a distinctive branding identifier that consumers widely associate with the Complainant's goods and/or services in a highly-public industry, since the early 2010s. The disputed domain name is identical with the Complainant's IDJ VIDEOS trademark.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain in October, 2022. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name was not used prior to January 2026, although the Respondent had long been active in the media business and had never previously used the disputed domain name or any similar designation. Given the distinctiveness and notoriety of the Complainant's IDJ VIDEOS trademark, the Respondent's lack of any credible legitimate explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name, the absence of demonstrable bona fide preparations for use, and the Respondent's conduct following receipt of the cease-and-desist letter from the Complainant, the Complainant submits that there is no plausible good-faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put. The Complainant adds that, during the Parties' prior correspondence, the Respondent stated that the disputed domain name represented an abbreviation for "Image Digital Junior Videos". However, the Respondent has failed to provide any contemporaneous evidence demonstrating that the acronym "IDJ" had independently stood for "Image Digital Junior" or was used accordingly prior to the present dispute. No such designation appears in the Respondent's branding, social media presence, promotional materials, or business communications. The Complainant therefore argues that this explanation is merely a post hoc attempt to justify the registration of the disputed domain name after assertion of the Complainant's rights. In accordance with the above, the Complainant submits that there is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent does not have trademark rights and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and seems to have attempted to use it for commercial gain and misleadingly to divert consumers from the trademark of the Complainant.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant contends that, in light of its extensive and long-standing use of the IDJ VIDEOS trademark before the registration of the disputed domain name, its position as a leading regional music production and digital media business, and the Respondent's own activities in audiovisual production, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant or its trademark. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name creates an impermissible "initial interest confusion", as Internet users searching for or encountering the disputed domain name would reasonably expect an association with the Complainant before even accessing the website. Such diversionary conduct in itself constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent had intended to unreasonably profit from the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name, as in their prior communication the Respondent de facto refused to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant, stating that it could only be effected on "mutually acceptable conditions" and that he is "open to an offer and a deal".

B. Respondent

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

The Respondent indicates that he registered the disputed domain name in October 2022 through the ordinary, publicly available registration process, without concealing his identity and in the good-faith belief

that he was free to do so. At the time of registration, the disputed domain name was available for registration by any person on equal terms. The Respondent further states that he has never used the designations "IDJ" or "IDJVideos" as a brand, logo, trade name, or identifier of his services. The Respondent's entire commercial presence (including website content, logo, social media accounts, promotional materials and his public-facing identity) is consistently and exclusively branded under "Junior Produkcija" and "Marko X Junior". The term "idjvideos" appeared solely in the disputed domain name itself and nowhere in the content, branding or presentation of the Respondent's services.

Regarding the first element, the Respondent contends that even though the Respondent does not dispute that the Complainant's IDJ VIDEOS trademark contains the same textual element as the disputed domain name, it is important to note that a search for "idjvideos" as a single word in WIPO's Global Brand Database does not display any registered trademark. The Respondent therefore submits that he acted in good faith and could not reasonably have been expected to have been aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Regarding the rights and legitimate interest, the Respondent indicates that the disputed domain name was used exclusively as an address pointing to the Respondent's genuine video-production offering, presented throughout under the Respondent's own "Junior Produkcija" branding. The Respondent did not seek to trade off the Complainant's goodwill, did not reproduce the Complainant's marks or get-up, and did not present his services as connected to the Complainant in any way. The Complainant's own evidence submitted with the Complaint confirms that the Respondent's business is, and always has been, branded "Junior". There is accordingly no risk that consumers reaching the Respondent's content would have understood it to originate from, or be endorsed by, the Complainant. The Respondent further argues that any Internet user reaching the website would immediately have encountered the "Junior Produkcija" branding and would therefore have understood that the website had no connection with the Complainant.

Regarding the registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Respondent argues that bad faith is assessed as at the moment of registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has adduced no evidence that, in October 2022, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of targeting the Complainant, selling the name to the Complainant, disrupting its business, or trading on its trademark. According to the Respondent, the Complainant's case rests almost entirely on the assertion that its brand is so well known that the Respondent could not have been unaware of it. However, the Respondent contends that mere awareness of a trademark does not equate to registration in bad faith, particularly where the Respondent operated in his own distinct name and made no use of the trademark as a brand. The Respondent alleges that he has registered a short, memorable domain name that he associated with his own project and that the Complainant does not have, and cannot have, an exclusive right to every conceivable domain name containing a given sequence of letters, as the trademark right does not confer a monopoly over all Internet addresses incorporating that combination. The Respondent also argues that the period during which the disputed domain name remained inactive is inconsistent with an intention to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant or otherwise exploit its trademark, and is instead consistent with the gradual development of a personal project. The Respondent submits that he made a plausible good-faith use of the disputed domain name by using it in connection with his genuine video-production business under the "Junior" branding. The Respondent further states that he did not offer the disputed domain name for sale, did not name a price, and did not solicit a purchase. He responded to the Complainant's own approach and indicated only a willingness to resolve matters on reasonable terms. A respondent's request that any transfer occur on "mutually acceptable conditions", or an openness to discussion, does not equate to the primary purpose of selling the disputed domain name to the mark owner for profit.

Finally, the Respondent indicates that if the disputed domain name were as central to the Complainant's rights as the Complaint suggests, it is not explained why the Complainant did not register it during the extended period in which it was freely and publicly available.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: “A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.” Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy stipulates that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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’s IDJ VIDEOS trademark is word/device mark that consists of verbal element IDJ VIDEOS in stylized letters and stylized depiction of person holding a screen. Panel assessment of identity or confusing similarity involves comparing the (alpha-numeric) disputed domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. Such design elements may be taken into account in limited circumstances e.g., when the domain name comprises a spelled-out form of the relevant design element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10.

The Panel, therefore, finds that the verbal element IDJ VIDEOS is the dominant textual component of the Complainant’s mark and is sufficient to establish standing under the first element and that 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 Complainant’s IDJ VIDEOS trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical with the Complainant’s trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In addition, it is well established that “.com”, as a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), is disregarded in the assessment of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel, therefore, finds that 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 sought to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case, however, the Panel finds that the evidence and arguments advanced are insufficient to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Panel notes the Respondent did not provide any credible explanation for choosing the disputed domain name, but has instead provided a detailed explanation focused on his own branding as "Junior Produkcija" and lack of use of the Complainant's trademark on the website to which the disputed domain name used to resolve and on other social media. The Panel underlines that mere absence of use of the Complainant's trademark on the website to which the disputed domain name used to resolve is insufficient in itself to establish rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent's side. The relevant question is not merely how the Respondent branded his website, but why he chose a domain name identical with the Complainant's trademark. In the case at hand, the Respondent used, without a credible explanation, the Complainant's IDJ VIDEOS trademark which enjoys significant reputation in Serbia, particularly in the field of music and video production, as a domain name that used to resolve to a web presentation of the Respondent's video production business under the name "Junior Produkcija". In the Panel's view, such use of the disputed domain name cannot be observed as bona fide offering of goods and services, as it is clear that the Respondent's services, albeit being bona fide in their nature, are offered through a domain name that appropriates the reputation associated with the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent has not demonstrated to be known by the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name. As a matter of fact, the Respondent admits that his business (which is within the same industry as the Complainant) is branded under the name "Junior Produkcija" and that he himself has been known under the names "Junior Produkcija" and "Marko X Junior". The Respondent must however be genuinely "commonly known" by the relevant moniker (e.g., a personal name, nickname, or corporate identifier), apart from the disputed domain name. Such rights, where legitimately held/obtained, would prima facie support a finding of rights or legitimate interests under the UDRP. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

Additionally, the Panel notes that the alleged explanation that the disputed domain name was intended as an abbreviation for "Image Digital Junior Videos" appears only in the correspondence that preceded this proceeding, as reported by the Complainant. The Respondent did not rely on that explanation in the present proceeding and submitted no evidence demonstrating use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, that designation in connection with his business. Accordingly, the Panel does not regard that explanation as supporting rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Since the disputed domain name is identical with the Complainant's trademark, it also carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Having in mind the above, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its IDJ VIDEOS trademark. It is highly unlikely that the Respondent decided to register a domain name containing this trademark in its entirety without having the Complainant and its well-known trademark in mind when doing so.

Particular circumstances panels may take into account in assessing whether the respondent's registration of a domain name is in bad faith include, inter alia, a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the respondent's choice of the domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. Having in mind that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name that is identical with the Complainant's IDJ VIDEOS trademark, that both Parties are located in Serbia, that they are active in the same industry and that the Complainant's IDJ VIDEOS trademark enjoys significant reputation within that industry, the Panel holds that it is very unlikely that the registration of the disputed domain name was a mere coincidence. On the contrary, all above factors coupled with use of the disputed domain name to promote the Respondent's video production business under the name "Junior Produkcija" suggest that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its IDJ VIDEOS trademark and, in fact, had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

Due to the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

As indicated above, the disputed domain name used to resolve to the web presentation of the Respondent's video production business branded "Junior Produkcija". Internet users encountering the disputed domain name would naturally expect it to identify a website attached to such a domain name as operated by, or associated with the Complainant. Instead, they were directed to the Respondent's own commercial website promoting his video-production services. The Panel deems that by such use of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website in accordance with the paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. This constitutes use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under the Policy.

While the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website, such inactivity does not prevent a finding of bad faith given the totality of the circumstances of the case at hand. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <idjvideos.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Stefan Bojovic/
Stefan Bojovic
Sole Panelist
Date: August 5, 2026