

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Wagamama Limited v. waga mama, iskills
Case No. D2026-2940

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Wagamama Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Charles Russell Speechlys LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is waga mama, iskills, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wagamama-menus.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 3, 2026. On July 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 July 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on August 15, 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 under the laws of England and Wales (United Kingdom). The Complainant has been registered at Companies House under the name Wagamama Limited since December 16, 1992 (having been incorporated on April 29, 1991 under a different name).

The Complainant operates a well-known chain of Asian-inspired restaurants trading under the name Wagamama. The first Wagamama restaurant opened in London in 1992. The Complainant currently operates over 220 restaurants in more than 15 countries, including more than 150 restaurants in the United Kingdom, as well as establishments across North America, Europe, the Middle East, and Asia.

The Complainant is the owner of the WAGAMAMA trademarks in multiple jurisdictions worldwide, including in Europe, the United States of States, India, the United Arab Emirates:

- (i) United Kingdom trade mark No. UK00900810010, word mark WAGAMAMA, registered on July 18, 2000, covering Classes 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 42;
- (ii) European Union trade mark No. 003102233, word mark WAGAMAMA, registered on April 18, 2005, covering Classes 35, 38, and 43; and
- (iii) United Kingdom trade mark No. UK00904718334, device mark (stylized WAGAMAMA), registered on November 14, 2006, in Class 43.

A full schedule of the Complainant's worldwide trademark portfolio was submitted as Annex 7 to the Complaint.

The Complainant operates the website at the domain name <wagamama.com>, which was registered on July 6, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 9, 2025. The website at the disputed domain name uses the WAGAMAMA mark and a logo confusingly similar to the Complainant's logo, displays images of dishes, some reportedly copied from the Complainant's own website, and reproduces copies of the Complainant's menus. The site provides information regarding food and beverages, ingredients, prices, and other information presented as relating to Wagamama restaurants.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on April 10, 2026, but no response was received.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

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 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 like "menus" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

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. [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 not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the addition of the term "menus", which relates directly to an aspect of the Complainant's restaurant business, creates a risk of Internet user confusion. Such composition may lead Internet users to expect that the website is an official source of information concerning the Complainant's menu offerings. In addition, according to the Complainant's evidence, although the website states under the "About Us" section that "We're not the official Wagamama company or franchise — we simply provide accurate, publicly available information in a clear format for your convenience", this information does not feature prominently on the homepage of the website. Rather, Internet users are first presented with the Complainant's trademark and a logo very similar to the Complainant's logo and extensive information relating to the Complainant's restaurant business, which may reinforce the impression that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainant before any disclaimer is encountered. Accordingly, the disclaimer does not dispel the initial confusion created by the disputed domain name and the overall presentation of the website.

In addition, although the Respondent's name includes "waga mama", there is no evidence on record demonstrating that the Respondent is commonly known by "waga mama" or by the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes the following circumstances:

- The disputed domain name was registered on November 9, 2025; this is more than three decades after the Complainant began using the WAGAMAMA mark and the registration of its own domain name <wagamama.com>.
- The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark together with the additional term "menus", directly related to the Complainant's restaurant business.
- The website at the disputed domain name uses the WAGAMAMA mark and a logo confusingly similar to the Complainant's logo, displays images of dishes, some reportedly copied from the Complainant's own website, and reproduces copies of the Complainant's menus, apparently without any disclaimer on the homepage.
- The Panel notes that the Respondent's name disclosed by the Registrar includes "waga mama". There is no evidence on record supporting it is the Respondent's genuine name. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds it is more likely than not that the registration data is false or was deliberately constructed to obscure the true identity of the Respondent, a practice that panels have recognized as a further indicator of bad faith.

Considering the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract 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 Respondent's website. Although there is a disclaimer under the "About Us" section on the website at the disputed domain name, as discussed under the second element, the Panel finds that the mere existence of such disclaimer cannot cure the Respondent's bad faith. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <wagamama-menus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: August 29, 2026