

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GeoGuessr AB v. brave andy
Case No. D2026-3000

1. The Parties

The Complainant is GeoGuessr AB, Sweden, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is brave andy, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <geoguessrfree.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 8, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 9, 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 (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 9, 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 9, 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 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Keiji Kondo as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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 Swedish company founded in 2013 in Stockholm, Sweden. The Complainant provides an online geography game named “GeoGuessr”, in which players from all over the globe are “dropped” anywhere in the world with the mission to find clues and guess their location on the world map.

Since launching in 2013, the game has become known worldwide, with over 100 million players in more than 140 countries. Each year the Complainant hosts a World Championship tournament, with players from Africa, the Americas, Asia-Pacific, Europe, and the Middle East. In 2025 the event took place in Copenhagen, Denmark, with a prize sum of USD 50,000 awarded to the winner. The championship attracted many online viewers through a live broadcast.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registration:

- Filing Date: December 16, 2013
- Registration Date: March 21, 2014
- Registration Number: 518045
- Jurisdiction: Sweden
- Classes: 9 and 41
- Type of Trademark: Figurative
- Trademark:



In addition to the above trademark registration, the Complainant owns an International trademark registration for the same figurative mark (registration number 1589907, of March 1, 2021), and International (registration number 1629478 of July 9, 2021), and European Union (registration number 018485909 of September 30, 2021) trademark registrations for GEOGUESSR (word mark).

The disputed domain name was registered on July 24, 2024. The disputed domain name was used to redirect traffic to a commercial website (the “Respondent’s Website”) at “www.guessrgame.io”, which displayed links to competing services.

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 Complainant is the owner of the trademark GEOGUESSR, which has been used extensively since 2013, in the European Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and in many other countries worldwide. The Complainant also owns many domain names that incorporate its GEOGUESSR trademark, including <geoguessr.com>.

The disputed domain name consists of “geoguessr”, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, and the generic term “free”.

The addition of a generic, descriptive term, such as “free” within the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, citing *Fuji Photo Film U.S.A., Inc. v. LaPorte Holdings*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0971](#), and section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), where it is stated: “Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.”

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” does not have any impact on the overall impression of the dominant portion of the disputed domain name and is therefore irrelevant when determining the similarity between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name.

Referring to the above, the disputed domain name must be considered confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

According to the Whois information, the owner of the disputed domain name was identified as Withheld for Privacy ehf of Reykjavik, Iceland. The Complainant was subsequently informed of the underlying registrant details residing in the United States.

To the best of the Complainant’s knowledge, no license or authorization of any kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent to register or use the Complainant’s trademark as a domain name or otherwise, and the Complainant has found no information indicating that the Respondent is somehow trading under any company name corresponding to the disputed domain name or that it has any other rights to the disputed domain name. Neither is the Respondent an authorized representative of the Complainant’s products or services and has never had a business relationship with the Complainant.

The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent has intentionally chosen the disputed domain name based on the Complainant’s trademark and fame and is using the disputed domain name to redirect traffic to the Respondent’s Website. On the Respondent’s Website, the Respondent is using the Complainant’s protected trademark to promote a variety of competing products or services that are not in any way related to the Complainant. The footer of the Respondent’s Website says that “GeoGuessr Free is an independent website” but provides no genuine information about the Respondent, and there is no disclaimer that accurately and prominently discloses the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant. Further, the links “About Us” and “Contact Us” on the Respondent’s Website do not provide any details about the Respondent.

In addition, it is clear that the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar does not correspond to the disputed domain name in any way, which is an additional circumstance indicating a lack of legitimate interest on the part of the Respondent. Further, the phone number provided by the Registrar as part of the registrant information is, in the Complainant’s opinion, most likely false or at a minimum inaccurate. Under the North American Numbering Plan (NANP), area codes strictly cannot begin with a 0 or a 1. Because it starts with 018, the phone number is an impossibility and cannot be routed.

Based on the above, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is actively attempting to create the false impression that the disputed domain name and the Respondent’s Website are somehow connected to, sponsored, or operated by the Complainant. The Complainant also argues that the Respondent is, for financial gain, attempting to unfairly capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant and the Complainant’s trademark.

An abundance of UDRP panels have previously recognized that using a trademark owner’s name, trademark, or other distinctive material on a website, is typically done in order to create an impression of association with the trademark holder. The Complainant cites *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Name*

Redacted, WIPO Case No. [D2019-3122](#), and *Aktiebolaget Electrolux v. Erhan Kamak*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1790](#).

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, the Complainant argues that the Respondent's activities will risk diluting and damaging the Complainant's valuable business and trademarks, and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant holds registrations for the trademark GEOGUESSR in a large number of jurisdictions worldwide, including e.g. Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, the European Union, India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The trademark holds priority first dating back to 2013.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 24, 2024. This date is subsequent to when the Complainant first obtained registered trademark rights for GEOGUESSR by more than a decade.

Given all of the above, the widespread use, reputation and recognition of the Complainant's trademark and its related services and products, and the aforementioned use of the disputed domain name, it is obvious that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant at the time of registration, and that it was the Complainant's business and trademark that motivated the Respondent to register and use the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Respondent cannot claim to have been using the disputed domain name without being aware of the Complainant's rights.

The Complainant further cites WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 3.2.1, which lists the mere nature of a domain name as a circumstance that can amount to registration and use in bad faith, and in addition, according to [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) section 3.1.4, "the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith". This is also determined in an abundance of decisions under the UDRP Policy,.

In another similar case, *The Aldo Group Inc. v. Xinyue Tao*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-1720](#), the Panel concluded that: "The Respondent has established and maintains a website to which the disputed domain name resolves, which creates an impression of an association with the Complainant. There is nothing posted on the website to indicate that the Complainant has no association with the website. Furthermore, images and text posted on the Respondent's website have been taken from the Complainant's website and used without authorization."

Similar circumstances apply in this case, and the registration and use of a domain name for such purposes as described above in this Complaint can by default never amount to legitimate use and is by nature in bad faith.

Finally, on June 1, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent. Before the filing of this Complaint, the Complainant had not received any reply to its letter. Accordingly, it seems clear that the Respondent must have noticed the Complainant's concerns with the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name, but has in effect chosen to ignore, or at least failed to respond, to the attempts of contacts made.

The failure of a respondent to respond to a cease-and-desist letter, or a similar attempt of contact, has been considered relevant in a finding of bad faith by previous panels..

Consequently, it is the Complainant's view that the Respondent, by registering and using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own 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.

The disputed domain name must therefore be considered to have been registered and used in bad faith.

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 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 Panel concludes that the entirety of the Complainant's trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The addition of a descriptive term "free" does not prevent finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, and it is well established that a gTLD does not affect the assessment of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.8, and 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

The name of the Respondent is "brave andy." It is in no way similar to the disputed domain name. Based on the available record, the Respondent has not been known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's Website, to which the disputed domain name redirected Internet users, displayed products that are in no way related to the Complainant. Nevertheless, the content on the Respondent's Website made it appear to be related to the products offered by the Complainant, though they are in fact competing with the Complainant's products. In this regard, although the Panel notes the Respondent's Website contained a disclaimer at the bottom page indicating it would be an "independent website", the Panel finds such disclaimer to be unclear and insufficient to prevent a risk of implied affiliation of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is not used in connection with bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Respondent's Website provides links to games that are similar to the Complainant's GeoGuessr in some manner. However, the contents of the Respondent Website as a whole seem to solicit Internet users to click the links provided by someone other than the Complainant. The Panel concludes that the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent cannot be regarded as noncommercial or fair use.

Accordingly, 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 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 that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name, which reproduces the entirety of the Complainant's trademark, to redirect Internet users to the Respondent Website where products competing with the Complainant's products are displayed. In addition, the Complainant's earliest trademark registration precedes the registration of the disputed domain name by more than ten years. In addition, the Respondent Website explicitly refers to the Complainant's GeoGuessr product; that is, the following sentence is found: "Unlike GeoGuessr, which uses Street View, City Guessr provides real-time videos of cities around the world, making it a dynamic and visually appealing alternative." Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent Website. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and has been using 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 <geoguessrfree.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Keiji Kondo/

Keiji Kondo

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2026