

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The All England Lawn Tennis Club (Wimbledon) Ltd v. My Store 2 Admin,
Wimbledon 2027

Case No. D2026-4041

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The All England Lawn Tennis Club (Wimbledon) Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is My Store 2 Admin, Wimbledon 2027, France

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wimbledon-ticket.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 9, 2026. On September 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 9, 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 ("Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0179213922, Contact Privacy Inc.") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 10, 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 September 10, 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 September 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules,

paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Maria Alejandra Lopez Garcia 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

The Complainant is The All England Lawn Tennis Club (Wimbledon) Ltd., a private limited company incorporated in the United Kingdom on June 13, 1979. The Complainant is an internationally recognized sporting organization responsible for hosting The Championships, Wimbledon. First held in 1877 and hosted annually in London, United Kingdom. The Championships comprise a range of competitions, including Gentlemen's and Ladies' Singles and Doubles, Mixed Doubles, Junior and Wheelchair events, drawing tennis players and spectators from around the world.

The Complainant's Championships have attracted more than 500,000 spectators; in 2024, total attendance was 526,455. The Complainant also has extensive international exposure through television, digital, and media broadcasting around the world. The global participation of leading tennis players, together with the international following of the Grand Slam tournaments, has further contributed to the worldwide recognition and reputation of the WIMBLEDON name and trademarks.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations in different jurisdictions, including in:

- United Kingdom trade mark for the term THE WIMBLEDON (word mark), Registration number UK00000040979, filed on November 19, 1884, registered on November 19, 1884, covering goods in International Class ("IC") 28;
- Norwegian trade mark for the term WIMBLEDON (word mark), Registration number 114103, registered on June 9, 1983, covering goods in ICs 25, and 28; and
- European Union trade mark for the term WIMBLEDON (word mark), Registration number 000207886, registered on June 18, 1998, covering goods and services in ICs 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 41.

The Complainant also owns domain names incorporating its WIMBLEDON trademark in their first-level portion, including <wimbledon.com>, created in 1998, <wimbledon.tickets>, created in 2015, and <wimbledontennis.tickets>, created in 2015, among others.

The domain name <wimbledon.com> serves as the Complainant's official website, while <wimbledon.tickets> and <wimbledontennis.tickets> actively redirect Internet users to "www.wimbledon.com/en_GB/tickets", the official section of the Complainant's website to provide information and services relating to tickets.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 24, 2026, and it currently resolves to an inactive website. The Complainant provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name resolved to a website purportedly offering tickets to the Complainant's events, reproducing elements of the Complainant's official website, including trademarks, products, services, tickets, and business activities.

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 WIMBLEDON and that the addition of the hyphen and the term "ticket" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark WIMBLEDON.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, in particular that at the time of filing the Complaint, on September 10, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to an error page displaying the wording "Something went wrong. What happened? This store is unavailable"; whereas previously, until at least August 26, 2026, it resolved to an active website prominently featuring the Complainant's WIMBLEDON trademark and logo, which was taken from the Complainant's official website. The Respondent's website also made direct references to the Complainant and its services under the trademark WIMBLEDON, including tickets offered for sale described as "Wimbledon 2027 – PreSale Centre Court Pass", "Court No. 1 – Wimbledon 2027", "Court No. 2 – Wimbledon 2027", and "Court No. 3 – Wimbledon 2027", referring directly to the Complainant, The Championships, Wimbledon, and its renowned tennis courts and sporting event. Additionally, the Complainant contends that such website displayed and offered for sale and purchase through a login, contact and payment sections, several merchandise products associated with the Complainant, while using copyrighted images taken from the Complainant's official website and reproduced without the Complainant's authorization, and that such activity clearly demonstrates an intent to deceive Internet users, which cannot constitute a legitimate, noncommercial, or fair use of the disputed domain name; instead, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name generates a false affiliation with the Complainant among the Internet users and seeks to impersonate the Complainant, and to incur in further frauds.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The structure of the disputed domain name and its use demonstrates that the Respondent registered it specifically having the Complainant's business activity and its WIMBLEDON trademark in mind; that, despite by the time of filing, the disputed domain name seems inactive, the use given by the Respondent, with the presence of a login and registration section, falsely suggests that Internet users may access or purchase the Complainant's products and/or services, which demonstrates the deceptive nature of the Respondent's conduct with significant cybersecurity risks, by impersonating the Complainant, which constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

In accordance with paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the absence of a Response, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint. The complainant bears the burden of proof; a respondent's default does not, by itself, mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3. Therefore, the Panel will decide this case based on the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence" standard. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.2.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark WIMBLEDON 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. 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, a hyphen and the term "ticket", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 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.

Nothing in the record suggests the presence of rights or legitimate interests in favor of the Respondent within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, especially when the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate the Complainant's business activity ultimately.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as impersonation, copycat sites, or other types of 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

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 by the time the disputed domain name was registered, the Complainant's trademark rights were more than established at a worldwide level, including in France, where the Respondent appears to be located. Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name and its subsequent use leave the Panel no doubt that the Respondent registered it with the Complainant's WIMDLEDOM trademark in mind, meaning in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

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.

Although the disputed domain name was inactive at the time the Complaint was filed, the Panel, considering the evidence submitted by the Complainant as of impersonation and the potential associated cybersecurity risks relating to the previous use of the disputed domain name, finds that the Respondent's conduct falls within the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as impersonation, copycat sites, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under 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 <wimbledon-ticket.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Maria Alejandra Lopez Garcia/

Maria Alejandra Lopez Garcia

Sole Panelist

Date: October 20, 2026