

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bazaarvoice, Inc. v. sheng long
Case No. D2026-3076

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bazaarvoice, Inc., United States of America (the “United States”), represented by Markmonitor Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is sheng long, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <bazaarvoice-data.cfd> and <bazaarvoiceworking.biz> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 13, 2026. On July 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 14, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 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 20, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on August 26, 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 technology company founded in 2005 and headquartered in Austin, Texas, United States. It provides software and data solutions that enable brands, manufacturers, and retailers to collect, manage, and display customer-generated content, including reviews, ratings, photos, videos, and product-related questions and answers. The Complainant's platform helps businesses distribute customer feedback across their own and partner websites, supporting informed purchasing decisions and providing insights into customer sentiment and product performance. The Complainant works with more than 12,000 brands and retailers globally and supports more than a billion shopper interactions each month through its network of e-commerce and retail websites. The Complainant has a significant international presence, with offices across North America, Europe, Asia-Pacific, and other regions, allowing it to serve clients on a global scale. The Complainant employs approximately 1,700 people globally.

The Complainant is the owner of a global portfolio of registered trademarks for BAZAARVOICE, including for instance the European Union registration No.010287415, registered on February 27, 2012, and the United States registration No. 4204752, registered on September 11, 2012.

The Complainant's main website is located at the domain name <bazaarvoice.com>

The disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cfd> was registered on March 4, 2026 and resolved to a website that featured a login portal. The website prominently displayed the Complainant's logo. The Respondent further used the slogan: "Take your business to the next level with Bazaarvoice" and included a copyright notice in the footer of the website stating "© 2025 Bazaarvoice". The disputed domain name had been used in connection with a phishing scheme. Links incorporating the first disputed domain name were distributed via WhatsApp to targeted individuals, apparently to mislead recipients into believing that they were dealing with the Complainant and to induce them, under false pretenses relating to compensation or the recovery of lost funds, to disclose sensitive information and/or transfer money. At the time of the Decision in the present case the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website.

The disputed domain name <bazaarvoiceworking.biz> was registered on June 20, 2026 and resolved to the same portal website as that previously associated with the disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cfd>. At the time of the Decision in the present case the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active 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 are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cfd> incorporates the Complainant's name and mark in its entirety, and only differs by the addition of the term "-data". Viewed as a whole, the Complainant's mark constitutes the dominant and distinctive element of the disputed domain name and remains clearly recognizable. The addition of the descriptive term "-data" does not serve to distinguish the domain name from the Complainant's mark. On the contrary, considering that the Complainant operates a platform providing data solutions, it only furthers the likelihood of confusion among

Internet users. Anyone who sees the disputed domain name will likely perceive it as a domain name belonging to the Complainant, or at least an entity related to or endorsed by the Complainant.

The same conclusions apply with respect to the disputed domain name <bazaarvoiceworking.biz>. The incorporation of the term “working” alongside the Complainant’s name and mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant’s mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that Internet users encountering the disputed domain name are likely to assume that it is owned, operated, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, or that it has been authorized, endorsed, or sponsored by the Complainant.

The generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLD”) “.cf” and “.biz” are required only for technical reasons and can be ignored for the purposes of comparison of the disputed domain names to the Complainant’s marks.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as BAZAARVOICE, “bazaarvoice-data” or “bazaarvoiceworking” prior to or after the registration of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any permission or consent from the Complainant to use its mark. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademarks incorporating the terms “bazaarvoice”, “bazaarvoice-data” or “bazaarvoiceworking”. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has ever traded legitimately under the name “bazaarvoice”, “bazaarvoice-data” or “bazaarvoiceworking”. Given that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s name and mark, there is no conceivable use to which the disputed domain names would confer any legitimate interest upon the Respondent.

The Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The nature of the disputed domain names creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant operates a data-driven business that provides customers with access to dashboards containing operational information, including information relating to working status and related performance metrics. The addition of the terms “-data” and “working” in the disputed domain names are terms which further indicate services related to the brand. Their inclusion therefore effectively impersonates, or at least suggests endorsement, by the Complainant. The Respondent cannot rely on any claim of fair use as a reseller, distributor, or service provider of the Complainant’s products and services.

The disputed domain names are not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent’s websites purport to be operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. The Respondent used at least the disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cf> as part of a broader fraudulent scheme. It is likely that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name <bazaarvoiceworking.biz> to continue the same conduct. The Respondent’s websites provide no basic company information, such as contact details, company name, registration number, or place of business. Passive holding of the disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cf> does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, legitimate noncommercial use, or fair use.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The disputed domain names consist of the Complainant’s mark in full, with the mere additions of the terms “-data” and “working” respectively. Internet users presented with the disputed domain names in search engine results are likely to believe that they are run by, connected with, or authorised by the Complainant. Such initial interest confusion is indicative of bad faith. Any initial interest confusion is reinforced, rather than dispelled, when Internet users reach the websites associated with the disputed domain names. The Respondent’s websites do not display any kind of disclaimer and have not undertaken any other reasonable steps to avoid confusion between them and the Complainant. Instead, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites, which appear to operate as a login portal prominently displaying the Complainant’s branding. The Respondent registered the disputed domain names with prior knowledge of the Complainant’s BAZAARVOICE mark and the Respondent’s purpose was to interfere with the Complainant’s business. The Respondent’s use of the

disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cfd> as part of a phishing and/or fraudulent scheme constitutes evidence of bad faith. Current passive holding of the disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cfd> constitutes bad faith. The disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's mark and name plus the terms "-data" and "working". Thus the nature of the disputed domain names reinforces the bad faith intentions of the Respondent. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's BAZAARVOICE mark. The Respondent's websites appear to operate as login portals that mimic the Complainant's online presence using the Complainant's branding, or at the very least misrepresent an affiliation or connection with the Complainant. The websites associated with the disputed domain names prominently display the Complainant's branding and logo and purport to provide a login platform. As such, it is strongly likely that the Respondent knew of, or should have known of, the Complainant when registering the disputed domain names.

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 applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Thus, the Panel disregards gTLDs ".cf" and ".biz" for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, a hyphen and "data" in the disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cfd>, and "working" in the disputed domain name <bazaarvoiceworking.biz>, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 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 fraud for the disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cfd>, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise authorize the Respondent to use its BAZAARVOICE trademarks, nor is there any evidence of an affiliation between the Parties.

The disputed domain names used to direct Internet users to websites with a logo similar to the Complainant's and designed to make the Internet users believe that they actually access the website of the Complainant or authorized by the Complainant. Past UDRP panels confirmed that such actions prove registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name (see *Daniel C. Marino, Jr. v. Video Images Productions, et al.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0598](#), and *Houghton Mifflin Co. v. The Weatherman, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0211](#)).

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 registered the disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademark adding the terms "data" and "working" descriptive for the Complainant's services, and placed websites prominently featuring the Complainant's logo. The Panel finds the Respondent knew and targeted the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain names, which is bad faith.

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.

According to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location. In this case, the disputed domain names were resolving to websites featuring the Complainant's logo and falsely pretended to be the website of the Complainant's or authorized by the Complainant to intentionally attract Internet users by creating likelihood of confusion with the

Complainant's trademark as to the source of the websites and their products. The Panel finds the above confirms the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed fraud for the disputed domain name <bazaarvoice-data.cfd> 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 current passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

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 <bazaarvoice-data.cfd> and <bazaarvoiceworking.biz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: September 4, 2026