

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Diners Club International Ltd. v. francisco Daigle
Case No. D2026-3968

1. The Parties

Complainant is Diners Club International Ltd., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Paul Law LLC, United States.

Respondent is francisco Daigle, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dinersclubb.com> (hereinafter "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 4, 2026. On September 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 11, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 11, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 16, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on October 12, 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

Complainant has used DINERS CLUB (hereinafter the “Mark”) since 1967 in connection with a global payments network currently accepted in more than 185 jurisdictions.

Complainant operates a website at the domain name <dinersclub.com>, where customers can apply for cards and research benefits. Additionally, Complainant provides consumer information about its goods and services.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for the Mark in several jurisdictions, including:

- United States registration No. 828013 (registered April 25, 1967);
- United States registration No. 6618926 (registered January 18, 2022); and
- European Union registration No. 002903045 (registered May 25, 2004) (stylized).

The Disputed Domain Name, which was registered March 28, 2026, resolves to a website containing pay-per-click (“PPC”) links to credit card services, including “Credit Card Debt Relief For Seniors, Restaurant Cashback Credit Program, Cashback Rewards, Credit Card With Cashback Rewards”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

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.

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, which varies from the Mark only by the addition of an extra “b” at the end of the Disputed Domain Name.

Domain names that consist of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) are considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant

mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

The website associated with the Disputed Domain Name displays PPC links to third party websites that offer various credit card services. “Applying UDRP paragraph 4(c), panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users.” [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Like prior panels¹, the Panel finds that the Mark is well known, and, accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent was likely aware of the Mark when it registered the Disputed Domain Name.

“The mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar [...] to a well- known trademark [...] can by itself create a presumption of bad faith”. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Moreover, Respondent’s addition of one letter to the otherwise identical domain name is considered typosquatting and in itself is evidence of bad faith registration and use. See *The Sportsman’s Guide, Inc. v. Vipercom*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0145](#), (finding that “Typosquatting is by itself strong evidence of bad faith in registration and use of a domain name.”).

¹ See *Diners Club International Ltd. v. 石磊 (Shi Lei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1257](#) (“These links are evidently based on the value of the Complainant’s DINERS CLUB trademark. The Panel considers this a further indication that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.”); and *Diners Club International Ltd. v. Edgar Coox, IniDesing*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0648](#) (“the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names in the knowledge of the Complainant’s trademarks and with the intention of benefitting from the commercial goodwill that attaches to those trademarks”).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent was aware of and intended to target Complainant's rights in the Mark when it registered the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel also finds that Respondent's display of PPC links to third party credit card services is bad faith use of the Disputed Domain Name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.1 (bad faith use finding based on "website content targeting the complainant's trademark, e.g., through links to the complainant's competitors [...]").

The Panel finds that 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 <dinersclubb.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: October 16, 2026.