

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AIRTKT.COM, INC. v. Tarun Kumar, Nature Hospitality
Case No. D2026-3744

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AIRTKT.COM, INC., United States of America (“United States” or “US”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Tarun Kumar, Nature Hospitality, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aiirtkt.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with BigRock Solutions Pvt Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 21, 2026. On August 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 22, 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.

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 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 Michael D. Cover as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 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 operates an online travel business available at “www.airtkt.com”. The Complainant’s online travel agency and flight booking platform offers consumers flight search and booking, cheap and discounted airfare, travel expert assistance and related travel services.

The Complainant is the proprietor of the following US trademark registration:

United States Registration No. 4,387,971 AIRTKT in International Class 39, registered on August 20, 2013, with a date of first use in commerce of March 1, 2000.

The Disputed Domain Name was created on March 30, 2026, and resolves to a website that brands the service offered under the sign AiirTKT and offers the same category of flight search, fare comparison, travel agent and ticket booking services covered by the Complainant’s (trademark) registration.

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.

The Complainant sets out that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant’s AIRTKT trademark in a readily-recognisable form, differing only by the duplication/insertion of one letter, “i” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”. The Complainant then submits that the added letter (“i”) does not prevent recognition of AIRTKT and that Internet users who type, read or remember AIRTKT may easily enter or perceive it as from the same source.

The Complainant concludes that it has satisfied the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant notes that the Complainant has never licensed, authorized, sponsored or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the AIRTKT trademark, to register a typographical variant of the trademark or to offer travel services under the name AIRTKT and that the Respondent is not an agent, affiliate, reseller, franchisee or a related business of the Complainant.

The Complainant then submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name and that the public registration record for the Disputed Domain Name identifies the Registrant as Tarun Kumar and lists Nature Hospitality for administrative and technical contacts and that neither name corresponds to Airtkt or Aiirkt. The Complainant continues that, under the heading of use in commercial not noncommercial or fair, the website solicits telephone booking, publishes purported fare offers, invites callbacks, collects a prospective traveler’s name, phone number, email address, origin, destination and travel date and states that service fees may apply. The Complainant concludes that this use is plainly commercial and intended to obtain travel leads and transactions.

The Complainant submits that the offering is not bona fide and cannot be bona fide under the Policy when it is made through an obvious one letter variant of another party’s registered mark and directly targets the same services and consumers.

The Complainant states that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Notably, the Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name was registered long after the registration of the Complainant's AIRTKT trademark, that targeting is evident from the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name and the website and that the Respondent is intentionally attracting for commercial gain Internet users to the Respondent's website and is also disrupting the business of a competitor, the Complainant.

Further, the Complainant claims that the Respondent used pre-existing, boilerplate website content to create the appearance of an established travel business, as the Terms & Conditions and Privacy Policy were dated January 2026, predating the registration of the disputed domain name by approximately two months. The website also appears to rely on Google Ads promotion to attract Internet users for commercial gain.

The Complainant concludes that the record shows both bad faith registration and bad faith use. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has selected a deliberate misspelling of a pre-existing registered trademark and deployed it as the source identifier for directly competing travel-booking services in order to obtain commercial leads and bookings.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant must establish on the balance of probabilities that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 its AIRTKT trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's AIRTKT trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. The addition of the letter "i" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's AIRTKT trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

In addition, it is well-established in prior UDRP decisions that the applicable gTLD, in this case ".com", is a standard registration requirement and may be ignored in considering confusing similarity, under [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) section 1.11.1 and this is the approach that the Panel has adopted in this Decision.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has been using the Disputed Domain Name to disrupt the business of the Complainant, and also to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s AIRTKT trademark.

Therefore, the Respondent has not demonstrated, before notice of the dispute, use or demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or that the Respondent is making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain misleadingly to divert consumers or to tarnish the reputation of the Complainant’s AIRTKT trademark. Moreover, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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 Complainant’s AIRTKT trademark was registered years before the registration of the disputed domain name. Considering the composition of the disputed domain name which is a misspelled version of the Complainant’s AIRTKT trademark and use of the disputed domain name as described above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and has been using the Disputed Domain Name to disrupt the business of the Complainant, and also to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark, which constitutes bad faith under 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 <aiirtkt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Michael D. Cover/

Michael D. Cover

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026