ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Omaze, Inc. v. rangzaib iqbal, royalejets
Case No. D2026-4079

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Omaze, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Bird & Bird, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is rangzaib iqbal, royalejets, United Kingdom ("UK").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <omazecompetition.com> and <omazegb.com> are registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 10, 2026. On September 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <omazecompetition.com>. On September 14, 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 (Privacy Service / Domain Protection Services, Inc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 15, 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 the first amended Complaint on September 18, 2026. The Complainant filed the second amended Complaint on September 29, 2026, including the additional disputed domain name <omazegb.com>. On October 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <omazegb.com>. On October 7, 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 together with the amended Complaints 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 October 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on November 3, 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 fundraising organization that offers prize draw competitions. It was established in the United States in 2012 and launched in the UK in 2020.

The Complainant offers prize draw competition services under the OMAZE trademark. Among various others, the Complainant is the registered owner of the United States Trademark Registration No. 4320140, registered on April 16, 2013, for OMAZE, covering protection for various services in classes 35, 41, and 42; and the United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00801391303, registered on August 3, 2018, for OMAZE, covering protection for various goods and services in classes 9, 25, 35, 36, 38, 41, and 42.

The Complainant further owns and actively uses the domain names <omaze.com> and <omaze.co.uk> for the promotion of its services.

The Respondent is reportedly located in the United Kingdom.

The disputed domain name <omazecompetition.com> was registered on August 15, 2026.
The disputed domain name <omazegb.com> was registered on September 11, 2026.

Initially, the disputed domain name <omazecompetition.com> resolved to a website in English language that purportedly offered prize draw competitions in the United Kingdom. On that website, the OMAZE trademark and official logos of the Complainant were prominently used. In addition, texts, graphics and the overall layout of the Complainant's official website were copied without a visible disclaimer describing the (lack of) relation between the Respondent and the Complainant. Moreover, documents submitted by the Complainant indicate that several customers have already been misled into believing that the associated website was operated by the Complainant. The disputed domain name <omazegb.com> was inactive at the time of submitting the Complaint.

At the time of this Decision, both disputed domain names did not resolve to active websites.

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 names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and

(iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2007-1228.

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview 3.1 and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

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., section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the OMAZE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the OMAZE mark is reproduced within all disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the OMAZE mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "competition" and "gb" respectively, 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 names 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 names. The Complainant has credibly submitted that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use the Complainant's OMAZE trademark. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent has particularly failed to demonstrate any of the nonexclusive circumstances evidencing rights or legitimate interests under the Policy, paragraph 4(c) or other evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name <omazecompetition.com>, which comprises the Complainant's OMAZE trademark in combination with the descriptive, non-distinctive term "competition" which directly targets the Complainant's prize draw competitions, resolved to a website prominently reproducing the Complainant's trademark, official logos as well as texts, graphics and the overall layout of the Complainant's official website, and thus, creating the overall look and feel of a website that is operated or endorsed by the Complainant's. The Panel also notes the composition of the disputed domain name <omazegb.com> which integrates the Complainant's OMAZE trademark in combination with the letters "gb" frequently used in reference to the Great Britain, implying an affiliation with the Complainant. Consequently, the Panel has no doubt that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its OMAZE trademark when registering the disputed domain names. In view of the Panel, these circumstances indicate the Respondent's illegitimate intention to mislead Internet users into believing that any website associated with the disputed domain names is an official website of the Complainant, likely for illegal purposes. This demonstrates the Respondent's deliberate attempt to pass itself off as the Complainant, which in view of the Panel 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.

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.

As already indicated above, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its OMAZE trademark when registering the disputed domain names. It is obvious to the Panel that the Respondent has deliberately chosen the inherently misleading disputed domain names, comprising the Complainant's OMAZE trademark in its entirety, to target the Complainant and mislead Internet users.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain names, the Panel once again notes that, for gaining illegitimate if not illegal commercial gain, the disputed domain name <omazecompetition.com> resolved to a probably scam website that prominently used the Complainant's OMAZE trademark, respective logos as well as texts, graphics and the overall layout of the Complainant's official website, thus creating the look and feel as if the associated website was operated by the Complainant or at least with its authorization. According to the Complainant, several customers were already misled into believing that the associated website was operated by the Complainant.

Panels have held that such use of a domain name for illegitimate and/or illegal activity, here particularly claimed passing off and impersonation, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

The fact that both disputed domain names do not currently resolve to active websites, does not prevent in the circumstances a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Taking all facts of the case into consideration, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy. Even more, the Panel is convinced that this is a typical cybersquatting case, which the UDRP was designed to stop.

Consequently, 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 names <omazecompetition.com> and <omazegb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/
Kaya Köklü
Sole Panelist
Date: November 16, 2026