

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Samaritan's Purse v. Domain Admin, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD
Case No. D2026-3106

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Samaritan's Purse, United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <samaritanpurse.org> is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 15, 2026. On July 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 16, 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 (Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 16, 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 16, 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 proceeding commenced on July 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a charitable organization headquartered in the United States and providing medical aid and disaster relief in many countries worldwide under the trade mark SAMARITAN'S PURSE (the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant is the owner of registrations in numerous jurisdictions for the Trade Mark, including United States registration No. 1,594,541, with a registration date of May 1, 1990; Canadian registration No. TMA433700, with a registration date of September 23, 1994; and Australian registration No. 676826, with a registration date of October 31, 1995.

The Complainant promotes its worldwide charitable programmes and services under the Trade Mark via its website at the domain name<samaritanspurse.org> (the "Complainant's Website").

B. Respondent

The Respondent is a privacy service in Panama.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was registered on March 6, 2002.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name is redirected to the Complainant's Website "www.samaritanspurse.org".

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, in light in particular of the manner of use of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and has used the disputed domain name 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 trade mark 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 trade mark 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 name. The disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of the Trade Mark (with the apostrophe and letter "s" missing from in between the words "Samaritan" and "purse"). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark 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.

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 light of the use of the disputed domain name – by redirecting it to the Complainant's Website, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith, under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 name <samaritanpurse.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: August 14, 2026