

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Age of Learning, Inc. v. Johan Sanjaya
Case No. D2026-3722

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Age of Learning, Inc., United States of America ("US"), represented by 101domain.com, US.

The Respondent is Johan Sanjaya, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <abcmouseapp.net> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 20, 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 21, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, 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 24, 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 27, 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 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu as the sole panelist in this matter on September 25, 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 developer of early learning programs designed by education experts to promote the academic success of children with a strong foundation in all subjects. The Complainant was founded in 2007 and released its award-winning education program for “ABCMOUSE” the same year. The Complainant notes that it has been operating in the education sector for nearly two decades, building worldwide brand recognition around its trademark ABCMOUSE.

The Complainant states that it holds over a dozen trademark registrations for ABCMOUSE in different jurisdictions, including the following:

- The Australian trademark registration No. 1261449 for ABC MOUSE, registered on September 10, 2008 in class 41; and
- The US trademark registration No. 5,465,099 for ABC MOUSE, registered on May 8, 2018, in classes 9 and 41.

The Complainant submits that it maintains an extensive portfolio of over 100 domain names, including <abcmouse.com> which was created on January 23, 2007, and used for the Complainant’s primary website.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 6, 2021. At the time of this Decision, it is inaccessible due to an invalid SSL certificate. However, the record shows that it was previously resolving to an active website that was featuring contents related to the Complainant’s learning programs and applications, displaying information about the Complainant, referencing the Complainant’s website at “www.abcmouse.com” and providing various links that can purportedly be used to download the Complainant’s application, and displaying content previously posted on the Complainant’s official website. There was also a disclaimer on the said website noting that the website “is not an official representative or the developer of this application, game, or product”. However, this disclaimer was written in small characters and is, in the Panel’s view, difficult to notice.

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 trademark in which the Complainant has rights; the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and the disputed domain name was registered and is being used 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 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 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, "app", 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 Panel notes the Complainant's assertion that it has neither licensed nor allowed the Respondent to use the ABCMOUSE trademark or tradename for any purpose. Nothing in the available record suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. In particular, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was previously resolving to a website that used content and images of the Complainant's application and website, and provided links that can purportedly be used to download the Complainant's application. The Panel also considers the composition of the disputed domain name, which fully incorporates the Complainant's trademark. In the Panel's view, the disputed domain name was used to target the Complainant's trademark and products, and to create Internet traffic to the Respondent's website by creating the impression that the disputed domain name and the said website were associated with or connected to the Complainant. The disclaimer, written in small characters, is not easily noticeable for Internet users and, in the Panel's view, fails to prominently disclose the lack of relationship with the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel concludes that such use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The fact that the disputed domain name is currently inaccessible does not alter the Panel's determinations.

By failing to submit a Response, 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.

Based on the available record, 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.

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 Panel considers the registration dates of the Complainant's trademarks and of the disputed domain name; the composition of the disputed domain name, which fully incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the term "app", evocative of the Complainant's product and services; and, in particular, the previous use of the disputed domain name as described above. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds it very likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant, its learning programs and its trademark, and registered the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark.

Considering the use of the disputed domain name described above, the Panel finds that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. As noted above, the Panel finds that the small disclaimer in the footer of the page is insufficient to prevent such risk of confusion and/or affiliation. The fact that the disputed domain name is currently inaccessible does not alter the Panel's determinations under the third element.

Accordingly, 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 <abcmouseapp.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu/

Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026