

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tencent Holdings Limited v. Muhammad ayub Khan, 7865 and Ayub Khan,
Midasbuy
Case No. D2026-3043

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tencent Holdings Limited, United Kingdom, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondents are Muhammad ayub Khan, 7865, Pakistan, and Ayub Khan, Midasbuy, Pakistan, self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <midasbuy.com.co> and <middasbuy.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 10, 2026. On July 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 13, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 14, 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 the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2026. The Respondent Ayub Khan, Midasbuy sent email communications to the Center on July 13 and 15, 2026. However, the Respondents did not file a formal Response.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on August 5, 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 in this administrative proceeding, Tencent Holdings Limited, is a leading provider of Internet value added services in China. On June 16, 2004, the Complainant went public on the main board of the Hong Kong Stock Exchange. The Complainant is the world's largest video game company. The Complainant's MidasBuy company is a top-up center for popular video games, music, videos, and other forms of entertainment.

The Complainant uses the domain name <midasbuy.com> to promote its services under the MIDASBUY brand. This primary domain name was registered on June 5, 2018, and has been in continuous use since then. According to Similarweb.com, the website had 3.169 million individual visits in May 2026 alone, making it the 13,236th most popular website in the world.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

United States of America Trademark registration number 6464615, for the MIDASBUY (device) trademark registered on August 24, 2021;

European Union Trade Mark registration number 018154572, for the MIDASBUY (device) trademark registered on March 13, 2020; and

- Japanese Trademark registration number 6369927, for the MIDASBUY trademark registered on March 29, 2021.

The disputed domain names <middasbuy.com> and <midasbuy.com.co> were registered on August 11, 2025, and October 29, 2025, respectively, and are currently not reachable.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain names previously resolved to websites that appeared to be copies and attempts to duplicate the Complainant's official website by featuring the Complainant's trademark and logo, the same design, color scheme and images as those displayed on the Complainant's official website.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names resolve to websites that have been purposely designed to serve as exact replicas of the Complainant's website, all as a means of deceiving Internet users into believing that the disputed domain names and their websites are associated with the

Complainant. The Complainant further claims that the Respondents' attempt to pass off the disputed domain names as being affiliated with the Complainant, and in fact as actually being the Complainant, is in itself evidence of the fact that the Respondents were aware of the Complainant's trademark and activity when registering the disputed domain names, and that the Respondents do not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii). The Complainant further contends that this is a case of impersonation and that misleading the Complainant's customers cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or fair use of the disputed domain names. On the contrary, this passing off is itself evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent Ayub Khan, Midasbuy sent two emails to the Center, the first to claim that it was the registrant of both disputed domain names and requesting that all future communications be addressed for its attention; and the second to inform that due to recent (unspecified) circumstances the Respondent Ayub Khan, Midasbuy had decided to sell the disputed domain names and thus has listed the same for sale on the Registrar's marketplace/auction platform.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue – Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The Respondent Muhammad ayub Khan, 7865, did not comment on the Complainant's request. The Respondent Ayub Khan, Midasbuy in its communication dated July 13, 2026, claimed that it is "actual registrant and owner of both domains".

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that (i) the disputed domain names were registered with the same Registrar and hosted on the same name servers, (ii) the disputed domain names resolved to highly similar websites, (iii) according to the Complainant, the "Contact Us" page available through the website at <midasbuy.com> disputed domain name listed the email address "[...]@midasbuy.com.co", and (iv) the Respondent Ayub Khan, Midasbuy confirmed and the Respondent Muhammad ayub Khan, 7865 did not object that the disputed domain names are indeed under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

In order for the Complainant to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain names, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. The disputed domain name <middasbuy.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and the disputed domain name <midasbuy.com.co> is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed as copycat site and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 was more likely than not aware of the Complainant's trademark registrations and rights to the MIDASBUY trademark when it registered the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names were registered a few years after the Complainant's trademark was registered. In addition, owing to the substantial presence established on the Internet by the Complainant, and considering the composition of the disputed domain names and the content of the corresponding websites, it is at the least very unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the existence of the Complainant, or of the Complainant's trademarks, when registering the disputed domain names.

Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain names, had knowledge of the Complainant's earlier rights to the MIDASBUY trademark.

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.

The websites under the disputed domain names appear to be designed to mislead Internet users in an attempt to pass itself off as the Complainant and/or create an impression of being affiliated with the Complainant, and this amounts to bad faith use of the disputed domain names.

The bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names are also affirmed by the fact that the Respondent did not formally respond to nor has denied the assertions of bad faith made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed as copycat site and passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

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

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 names <midasbuy.com.co> and <middasbuy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2026