

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jaguar Land Rover Limited v. Gergana Raycheva, Edoms LLC
Case No. D2026-3132

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jaguar Land Rover Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Briffa Legal Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Gergana Raycheva, Edoms LLC, Bulgaria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <newrangeroversport.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with DropCatch.com 844 LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 16, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. On July 27, 2026, the Center sent an email communication to the Complainant providing the additional registrant contact information disclosed by the Registrar and advising that no formal action or reply was necessary.

The Center verified that 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a manufacturer of vehicles. The Complainant sold more than 225,000 vehicles in 2025.

The Complainant is the owner of a portfolio of registered trademarks worldwide for the words RANGE ROVER, such as European Union trademark number 143792 (registered February 3, 1999). The Complainant invests in a number of partnerships to promote the Range Rover Marks. The Complainant uses the domain name <rangerover.com> for the website of its Range Rover vehicles. The Range Rover Marks are also used by the Complainant on its social media platforms.

The Domain Name was registered on September 2, 2023. The Complainant documents that the Domain Name has resolved to a website with links to third-party commercial websites. At the time of Decision, the Domain Name resolved to an error page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that its trademark is well-known.

The only differences between the Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark are that the Domain Name contains the descriptive and non-distinctive words "NEW" and "SPORT". These additional words are in the Complainant's view not enough of an addition to avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain

Name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the Range Rover Marks. The Complainant submits that the only plausible explanation for the Domain Name being registered is to abuse the Complainant's rights in the Range Rover Marks. The Respondent has sought to unfairly piggyback on the reputation of the Complainant. The Domain Name creates an implied affiliation with the Complainant where none exists. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name, to resolve to third party commercial websites, is not bona fide as it is designed to exploit internet traffic by misrepresenting a connection with the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant argues that there is a presumption of bad faith as the Respondent has registered without authorization the Complainant's famous trademark only with descriptive terms added. Given the repute of the Complainant and its trademark, and the lack of authorization from the Complainant, there is no possible good faith use to which the Domain Name could be put by the Respondent. By using the Domain Name to divert Internet users to the redirection websites, the Respondent is intentionally attracting users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Range Rover Marks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Finally, the Respondent has been the subject of multiple prior WIPO UDRP decisions in which panels found bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Domain Name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark RANGE ROVER. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of "NEW" and "SPORT". These additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. For the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the use of the Domain Name, as described above, is evidence of bad faith. The Panel finds also that the composition of the Domain Name signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Name and the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

Based on the composition of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Name. The Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, the Respondent has used the Domain Name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website and other online locations (including third parties' websites) by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Such conduct demonstrates bad faith registration and use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finally notes that the Respondent has been the subject of prior WIPO UDRP decisions (see *Blackbaud, Inc. v. Gergana Raycheva, Edoms LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1762](#); *Red Bull GmbH v. Gergana Raycheva, Edoms LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1005](#); *Senhwa Biosciences, Inc. v. Gergana Raycheva, Edoms LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0294](#).) and is no stranger to registering domain names similar to famous trademarks in bad faith.

Based on the available record, 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 Domain Name <newrangeroversport.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: September 21, 2026