

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Expo 2030 Riyadh Company v. Raid Alkhuzam, AdMedia.co
Case No. D2026-3535

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Expo 2030 Riyadh Company, Saudi Arabia, represented by Bird & Bird (MEA) LLP, United Arab Emirates.

The Respondent is Raid Alkhuzam, AdMedia.co, Saudi Arabia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <expocityriyadh.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 10, 2026. On August 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 12, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 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 August 18, 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 proceedings commenced on August 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 8, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on September 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 company established specifically for the purpose of organizing and hosting Expo 2030 in Riyadh and owns trademark registrations for RIYADH EXPO 2030 such as:

- Saudi Arabia trademark registration No. 1444005055 (word), registered on January 23, 2023;
- Saudi Arabia trademark registration No. 1444028316 (figurative), registered on May 18, 2023.

The Complainant offers its services under the domain name <expo2030riyadh.sa>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 14, 2023, and resolves to a webpage offering the disputed domain name 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 disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces a dominant feature of the Complainant's trademark, which are the words "expo" and "Riyadh". The addition of the word "city" does not eliminate confusing similarity but instead increases confusion. It is customary for the Expo event organizer to manage the sites for hosting the exhibitions – usually referred to as "Expo City". The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" should be disregarded.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not given the Respondent authorization or license to register the disputed domain name. There is no information of Respondent's ownership of any relevant intellectual property rights.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was created after the Complainant had filed its trademark registration application, after the Complainant's candidature was announced and after the Complainant became active on social media. The disputed domain name resolves to a page that merely displays links to the Respondent's social media accounts and information that the disputed domain name is for sale. The Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark. Registering the disputed domain name at a time when the Complainant's candidature was attracting considerable international attention and the Complainant was actively promoting the event, is a strong indication that the Respondent was aware of and sought to capitalize on the prominence and goodwill associated with the Riyadh Expo 2030. There is no credible explanation for selecting the disputed domain name other than evoking the Complainant's event. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent submits that any similarity, if established, does not establish the purpose for which the disputed domain name was registered nor that it targeted the Complainant or its trademark.

On rights or legitimate interests, the Respondent argues that the absence of authorization from the Complainant is not sufficient to show a lack of rights or legitimate interests. The disputed domain name consists of common terms (“Expo”, “City”, and “Riyadh”), and the Complaint provides no direct evidence that it was registered to target the Complainant or to sell the disputed domain name to it.

On bad faith, the Respondent contends that registration of the disputed domain name after the announcement of Riyadh’s Expo 2030 candidature does not, by itself, prove an intention to target the Complainant. The Complaint relies on assumptions about the Respondent’s motives rather than direct evidence.

The sale page was added two years after the creation of the disputed domain name. A sale page does not establish that the primary purpose of the registration in 2023 was to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant or taking advantage of its trademark. The Complainant assumes that the Expo site will be called Expo City Riyadh, and concludes from that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to target the Complainant. There is not enough evidence supporting such conclusion. The disputed domain name is not presented as being the Complainant’s official website, nor claims a relationship or sponsorship or affiliation with the Complainant. It is also not used for a competing activity.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The dominant feature of the Complainant’s trademark, the words “expo” and “Riyadh” appear in the reverse order in the disputed domain name and the number “2030” is omitted. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is 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, “city” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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 name. The Respondent has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel notes the Respondent's argument that the disputed domain name is composed of the words “expo”, “city”, and “riyadh”, each having its own independent meaning. However, the Respondent has not provided evidence of any actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name corresponding to any descriptive meaning of those terms. Nor has the Respondent demonstrated that it has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or acquired any trademark or other rights in it. In particular, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website whereby the disputed domain name is being offered for sale.

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 aware of the Complainant and its trademark. The Respondent did not deny such knowledge but simply argued that it does not mean the disputed domain name targets the Complainant. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website whereby the disputed domain name is being offered for sale.

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.

To the extent that this page does not contain active content beyond the statement “the domain name ExpoCityRiyadh.com is for sale”, this Panel will address the status of this website as if it was a case of passive holding. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant, the failure of the Respondent to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. In addition, registering the disputed domain name at a time when the Complainant's candidature was attracting considerable attention, particularly noting the Parties location, and the Complainant was actively promoting the event, is a strong indication that the Respondent was aware of and sought to capitalize on the similarity with the Complainant's trademark.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is offered for sale. The Panel finds this further supports the finding of the Respondent's bad faith in 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 name <expocityriyadh.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2026