

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

priceline.com LLC v. Sam John
Case No. D2026-2826

1. Procedural History

The Complainant is priceline.com LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Sam John, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pricelineagency.com> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 29, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 30, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Perfect Privacy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 6, 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 July 7, 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").

On July 7, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center consenting to the transfer of the disputed domain name. The Center sent a Possible Settlement email to the Parties on July 8, 2026. The Complainant sent an email requesting suspension on July 9, 2026, and the Center notified the Parties on the same day of the suspension of the proceedings. A settlement did not materialize and at the Complainant's request, the proceedings were reinstituted on August 27, 2026.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on September 20, 2026, in reply to which the Respondent sent an email communication. On September 22, 2026, the Center sent the Possible Settlement email to the Parties, and no suspension request was received from the Complainant by the set due date.

The Center appointed Steven Auvil as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 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 provider of online travel booking and travel agency services. Since at least 1997, the Complainant has offered travel-related services, including reservations for flights, hotels, rental cars, cruises, and vacation packages.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark PRICELINE, including United States Registration No. 2272659 for PRICELINE, registered August 24, 1999, and United States Registration No. 2481112 for PRICELINE.COM, registered August 28, 2001. The Complainant maintains its primary web presence through its website at “www.priceline.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 23, 2026. According to the Complainant’s evidence, the disputed domain name was used for a website offering travel booking services that competed with those of the Complainant.

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.

The Complainant first contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its PRICELINE trademark because it incorporates the mark in its entirety and merely adds the descriptive term “agency”. Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith to divert Internet users seeking the Complainant’s travel services.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal Response. However, on July 7, 2026, and again on September 20, 2026, the Respondent stated that he did not contest the Complaint or the requested transfer remedy.

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to decide on the remedy sought by the Complainant, each of the following three elements will be examined:

- (i) the disputed domain name is 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 with respect to the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

However, considering WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.10, the Panel notes that consent to transfer by the respondent can provide a basis for an order for transfer without a need for substantive consideration of the UDRP grounds. See *Lloyds Bank Plc v. A. A.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-2124](#); *Sandvik Intellectual Property AB v. Emil Yakubov*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1722](#).

In the case at hand, the Panel finds that the Respondent showed his consent to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant on July 7, 2026 and again on September 20, 2026. Specifically on July 7, 2026, prior to the constitution of this Panel, the Respondent stated “I consent to the transfer of the domain name to the Complainant and do not contest the Complaint”. After a delay while attempting to formalize an agreement under paragraph 17 of the Rules, the Complainant requested the proceeding continue. However, on September 20, 2026, the Respondent stated “I hereby consent to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. I do not contest the requested remedy and I ask that the transfer be given effect without further proceedings”.

In light of the Respondent’s expression that he does not contest the Complaint or the requested transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant, the Panel considers it appropriate to order transfer without discussing the merits, giving effect to the understood Party agreement as to the disposition of their case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.10.

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 <pricelineagency.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven Auvil/

Steven Auvil

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026