

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Granada Investment Centre v. SEO SPACE, Seo Space
Case No. D2026-3400

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Granada Investment Centre, Saudi Arabia, represented by Bird & Bird (MEA) LLP, United Arab Emirates.

The Respondent is SEO SPACE, Seo Space, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <granadamall.info> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 30, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 10, 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 August 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 6, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on August 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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 Saudi Arabian company that operates the Granada Mall, a well-known shopping mall in Riyadh which was opened in 2005, has 300 retail units and receives over 800,000 visitors per month.

The Complainant holds a trademark registration for a mark consisting of the words “GRANADA MALL” in English and Arabic and a distinctive “G” logo (“GRANADA MALL Mark”) in Saudi Arabia (Registration No. 1440006858, registered February 5, 2019, for services in class 36).

The Domain Name was registered on August 16, 2025. The Domain Name is presently inactive (resolving to a page maintained by the Registrar) but prior to the commencement of the proceeding resolved to a website (the “Respondent’s Website”) that purported to offer information related to the Complainant’s Granada Mall. The Respondent’s Website reproduced the GRANADA MALL Mark, contained no disclaimer (and indeed contained the copyright notice “Copyright © 2026 Granada Mall Riyadh”) and purported to offer products for sale.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) It is the owner of the GRANADA MALL Mark, having registered the GRANADA MALL Mark in Saudi Arabia. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the GRANADA MALL Mark as it merely excludes the device elements and adds the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.info” to the mark.
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not granted any license or authorization for the Respondent to use the GRANADA MALL Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the GRANADA MALL Mark, nor does it use the Domain Name for a bona fide purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Rather the Respondent is using the Domain Name to pass off as the Complainant for commercial gain by reproducing the Complainant’s mark and purporting to offer competing retail services at the Respondent’s Website. Such use is not a legitimate use of the Domain Name.
- c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the Domain Name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Respondent’s Website to disrupt the Complainant’s business and for commercial gain. Such conduct amounts to registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant’s contentions. On August 14, 2026, the Respondent sent an email to the Center in which it stated, on a without admissions basis, that it did not wish to renew the Domain Name.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The Panel notes that the device element in the GRANADA MALL Mark can be disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element as they would be incapable of being reproduced in a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10.

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.

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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made 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. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.
- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.
- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.4.

- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The Respondent has used the Domain Name to direct visitors to the Respondent's Website that, under the Complainant's GRANADA MALL Mark (and absent a disclaimer), purports to offer competing retail services and indeed actively misleads visitors by asserting that it is the official website of the Complainant's Granada Mall. Such conduct, involving the misleading suggestion that the Respondent (and the Respondent's Website) is in some way connected to the Complainant, does not, on its face, amount to the use of the Domain Name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its reputation in the GRANADA MALL Mark at the time the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Respondent's Website actively asserts that it is connected with the Complainant, including providing information about the Complainant's Granada Mall and reproducing the GRANADA MALL Mark. The registration of the Domain Name in awareness of the GRANADA MALL Mark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

The Respondent has used the Domain Name, being confusingly similar to the GRANADA MALL Mark, to attract visitors to its website where it misleadingly suggests a connection to or an association with the Complainant, likely for commercial gain in some form. Such an action satisfies the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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 <granadamall.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Smith/

Nicholas Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2026