

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Block, Inc. v. Md Sumon Mia
Case No. D2026-3012

1. The Parties

Complainant is Block, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP, United States.

Respondent is Md Sumon Mia, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cash-app.store> is registered with Spaceship, 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 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 10, 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 Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 14, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 15, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 6, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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

Complainant, together with its predecessors and affiliates (collectively “Complainant”) is a multinational company based in the United States. For almost a decade prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered financial products and services under the mark CASH APP. Complainant is the owner of several registrations for the CASH APP mark. These include, among others, United States Registration No. 5,911,567 (registered November 19, 2019). Complainant promotes its business at the website “www.cash.app”.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 10, 2026. Shortly after the registration, the disputed domain name resolved to an error page indicating “This page could not be found” and used Complainant’s logo in its favicon. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that its use of the CASH APP mark has been “extremely successful,” becoming “the number one finance app on the Apple App Store and Google Play” in the United States as of May 2026, when the disputed domain name was registered. Complainant further boasts a “user base of 59 million monthly active users worldwide”, receiving recognition and awards including from USA Today for 2026. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates in full Complainant’s CASH APP mark, with the inclusion only of a non-source-identifying hyphen.

Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as demonstrated by Respondent’s prior use of the disputed domain name to impersonate Complainant. Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, nor any license to use its marks. Complainant contends that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, with knowledge of Complainant’s superior rights, presumably for Respondent’s own commercial gain.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the CASH APP mark, for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that the CASH APP mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of a hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 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.

Complainant has established rights to the mark incorporated in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not put forward any claims or evidence that would suggest rights or legitimate interests for purposes of the Policy. In addition, shortly after the registration, the dispute domain name resolved to a website using the Complainant's logo in its favicon. Considering this and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds there is a risk that Internet users may associate the disputed domain name with Complainant.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel's decision, the disputed domain name previously resolved to an error page using the Complainant's logo in its favicon, and it is currently inactive. It is nevertheless well established that the passive holding of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3, which notes that the “non-use of a domain name” does not necessarily negate a finding of bad faith.

Rather, a panel must examine the totality of the circumstances, including, for example, whether a complainant has a well-known trademark, and whether a respondent takes active steps to conceal its identity or replies to the complaint. The Panel finds that Complainant has established prior rights in the CASH APP mark, as well as a fair degree of consumer exposure in the United States and globally. Respondent did not submit any reply to Complainant's contentions in these proceedings. Considering these and the prior use of the Complainant's logo in the favicon of the website at the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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

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 <cash-app.store> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: August 31, 2026