

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PayPal, Inc. v. Dantra Business, INC
Case No. D2026-3693

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PayPal, Inc., United States of America (“U.S.” or “United States”), represented by Stobbs IP Ltd, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Dantra Business, INC, British Virgin Islands, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <paypalmex.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 18, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 18, 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 19, 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 24, 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 16, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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 was founded in 1998 and is a leading global online payment company. Through its various websites and software, the Complainant provides services for users to send and receive payments online without sharing financial information.

The Complainant's PayPal platform is available in more than 200 markets around the world. The Complainant's official website is located at <paypal.com> which the Complainant has owned and operated since 1999.

The Complainant's PayPal platform has a large user base, with approximately 426 million active users worldwide.

Since its platform launched in 1999, the Complainant has used the PAYPAL mark in connection with its goods and services. The PAYPAL mark has appeared on television, in print, and internet advertisements, and enjoys a substantial reputation. The PayPal app is among the most downloaded apps on Google Play and the Apple App Store. In 2024, PayPal was ranked in the Top 100 Most Valuable Global Brands in the annual Kantar BrandZ survey.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in many jurisdictions for the PAYPAL mark in connection with its online payment software and services, and related goods and services. For example, the Complainant owns United States Reg. No. 3,069,209 for the mark PAYPAL, registered on March 14, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 27, 2026.

The Respondent did not file a Response, so little information is known about the Respondent.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent appears on a public warning list published by the UK Financial Conduct Authority ("FCA"), which identifies the Respondent, trading as "CredoTrade", as a business that has targeted United Kingdom consumers with financial services for which it is not authorised.

When the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website titled "PayPalmex" offering payment processing services for businesses. The website at the disputed domain name included the statement "PayPalmex is operated under Palmex Group Inc." and advertised an address in Vancouver, Canada.

At the present time, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an 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 name.

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions.

The disputed domain name incorporates the PAYPAL mark in its entirety as the distinctive and dominant element of the domain name. Internet users would regard the PAYPAL element as the recognisable source of identification within the disputed domain name.

The additional element of the disputed domain name, namely “mex” is not a distinctive term. The Complainant submits that “mex” appears to be a portmanteau combining “PayPal” with “Palmex” (a reference to Palmex Group, Inc., a FINTRAC-registered crypto exchange operating at <palmexgroup.io>). Regardless, the suffix does not distinguish the disputed domain name from that of the PAYPAL mark.

The Respondent has been publicly identified by the FCA as a business that has targeted United Kingdom consumers with financial services activities for which it holds no authorization. The provision of unauthorised financial services to United Kingdom consumers is a criminal offence, and conduct of this nature is not the type of use that the Policy is intended to protect. Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

In addition, the disputed domain name resolves to a website which lacks financial regulatory statements, compliance documentation, and verifiable contact information, and which fraudulently juxtaposes the Complainant’s PAYPAL mark with a reference to a legitimate third party, Palmex Group, Inc. (a FINTRAC-registered crypto exchange). These further indicia are consistent with a phishing or fraud scheme and reinforce the Complainant’s position that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 entirety of the PAYPAL mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. 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, “mex”) 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.

Moreover, regardless of whether one considers the addition of “mex” to be a portmanteau combining “PayPal” with “Palmex”, or the reproduction of the third-party mark “Palmex” together with the term “pay”, the PAYPAL mark remains recognizable in the disputed domain name.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Complainant’s PAYPAL mark is extremely well-known, and the Respondent used the disputed domain name to promote services similar to those of the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The Panel also notes that the address used on the website at the disputed domain name is the address of Palmex Group Inc. of Canada. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name could be read as “Pay Palmex” and that the reproduction of Palmex Group Inc.’s address further reinforces the Complainant’s allegations of fraud. The Panel notes the extremely well-known nature of the PAYPAL mark, and that the website at the disputed domain name reproduces an image of a credit card

bearing the terms “PayPalmex” where the selected font type, if not identical, highly resembles the font typically used by the PAYPAL mark. While Palmex Group Inc. is not a party to this proceeding, the Panel considers it is likely that the Respondent was targeting both Complainant and Palmex Group Inc. by selecting a portmanteau of “PayPal” and “Palmex”.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

This is a case of intentionally attracting, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website by creating a false impression of affiliation with Complainant and its famous trademark, in violation of 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 <paypalmex.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

Following established panel practice, the transfer of the disputed domain name shall be ordered without prejudice to any rights of the third party Palmex Group Inc. in the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.13.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2026