ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Uber Technologies, Inc. v. Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC / DomainMarket Holdings LLC
Case No. D2026-4087

1. The Parties

Complainant is Uber Technologies, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

Respondent is Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC / DomainMarket Holdings LLC; United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <bikeuber.com>, <uberalternative.com>, <ubercareers.com>, <uberclan.com>, <ubercontainers.com>, <uberinsurancepolicy.com>, <uberinvestors.com>, <uberlimos.com>, <uberlove.com>, <uberrestaurants.com>, <uberroadsideassistance.com>, <ubervegan.com>, <uberwald.com>, <uberway.com> and <youruber.com> (hereinafter "Disputed Domain Names") are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (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 Names. On September 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names. The Registrar confirmed that Michael F Mann, who Complainant named in the original Complaint, was, as alleged, the named Registrant for all 15 Disputed Domain Names. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 14, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. In response, on September 14, 2026, Complainant sent an email to the Center confirming that, as alleged in the Complaint, all the Disputed Domain Names had the same registrant.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 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. The Response was filed with the Center on October 6, 2026. Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing on October 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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, a public company founded in 2009, has been traded on the New York Stock Exchange since May 10, 2019, and was included in the S&P 500 in December 2023. Complainant uses UBER (hereinafter the "Mark") as a trademark in connection with its technology platform to offer many services including rideshare services that connect consumers with independent drivers in more than 70 countries. As of December 31, 2025, Complainant and its subsidiaries had approximately 34,000 employees delivering services to 202 million customers in more than 15,000 cities around the world, and thereby generating more than USD 52 billion of revenue.

Complainant is the registrant of numerous domain names, including <uber.com>, which it uses in connection with its primary website.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for the Mark in many jurisdictions. Its oldest is United States registration No, 3,842,416 (registered August 31, 2010) for UBER CAB. It also owns United States Registration No. 3,977,893 (registered June 14, 2011) for UBER.

The Disputed Domain Names were created as follows:

- <bikeuber.com>: Created on February 10, 2016
- <uberalternative.com>: Created on April 10, 2016
- <ubercareers.com>: Created on May 17, 2015
- <uberclan.com>: Created on May 9, 2016
- <ubercontainers.com>: Created on February 14, 2016
- <uberinsurancepolicy.com>: Created on December 21, 2015
- <uberinvestors.com>: Created on January 30, 2016
- <uberlimos.com>: Created on February 11, 2012
- <uberlove.com>: Created on June 11, 2011
- <uberrestaurants.com>: Created on June 12, 2016
- <uberroadsideassistance.com>: Created on December 26, 2015
- <ubervegan.com>: Created on January 29, 2011
- <uberwald.com>: Created on April 5, 2003
- <uberway.com>: Created on February 1, 2007
- <youruber.com>: Created on January 23, 2015

All of the Disputed Domain Names are offered for sale at prices ranging from USD 500 to USD 24,888 each, with an average price of USD 5,395.47. On most of the webpages promoting the sale of the Disputed Domain Names, Respondent refers to Complainant, the Mark or the usefulness of the Disputed Domain Name to promote ridesharing services:

- <bikeuber.com>: "This domain is perfect for startups in the transportation, tech, or urban planning industries looking to revolutionize the way people move."
- <uberalternative.com>: "Whether you're in the ride-hailing sector looking for an alternative solution or aiming to offer an Uber-like service in a different field, this domain name is an excellent choice."

- <ubercareers.com>: "The domain's strong association with Uber – a globally recognized brand synonymous with innovation and efficiency – adds credibility to your business."
- <uberclan.com>: "The 'Uber' prefix suggests speed, ease, and convenience…"
- <ubercontainers.com>: "This makes it a perfect choice for businesses involved in container logistics, manufacturing, technology, or any related field."2
- <uberinsurancepolicy.com>: "UberInsurancePolicy.com is an attractive and memorable domain name for businesses offering insurance policies, particularly those related to rideshare services like Uber."
- <uberlimos.com>: "UberLimos.com is an ideal domain name for entrepreneurs seeking to combine the convenience of ride-hailing apps with the luxury and professionalism of limousine services…. It can also be used by existing Uber or taxi businesses looking to expand their offerings and attract high-end clientele."
- <uberrestaurants.com>: "UberRestaurants.com is a unique and memorable domain that combines the trusted brand of Uber with the food industry."
- <uberroadsideassistance.com>: 3 "It can also be beneficial for businesses that offer related services, such as car rental companies or insurance providers."
- <ubervegan.com>: "This domain name can be used for various purposes such as creating a blog or website dedicated to vegan food, launching a food delivery service, or even starting a plant-based product e-commerce store."
- <uberwald.com>: "Imagine a ride-sharing app that takes urban mobility to the next level, or a high-end fashion brand that redefines luxury."
- <uberway.com>: "Industries such as technology, transportation, and creative services can particularly benefit from this domain name."
- <youruber.com>: "It's perfect for ride-hailing, taxi, or transportation services, instantly connecting you with potential customers in the industry."

Two of websites at the Disputed Domain Names, namely <uberinvestors.com> and <uberlove.com>, do not reference the Mark or rideshare services.

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 Names.

Notable, Complainant contends that Respondent is a serial cybersquatter, having lost several prior cases under the Policy, including two cases in which Complainant prevailed.[1]

B. Respondent

Respondent did not respond to the allegations of the Complaint. Instead, Respondent advised that it was willing unconditionally to transfer all the Disputed Domain Names to Complainant, but requested that the Panel not make findings on the merits. Respondent further asserted that its consent was not an admission of liability or an admission that Complainant has satisfied any element of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

---

[1] Complainant prevailed in two prior cases against Respondent. *Uber Technologies, Inc. v. Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2026-2014; and *Uber Technologies, Inc. v. Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2026-1270. In addition, Respondent has lost at least 12 other decisions under the Policy, resulting in the transfer of at least 34 domain names. *See, Khadi & Village Industries Commission v. Michael F Mann, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2021-3242; *Victor Alvarado D/B/A Active Rings v. Michael F Mann / Domain Asset Holdings, LLC*, Forum Claim No. 1772887; *National Cable Satellite Corporation, d/b/a C-SPAN v. Michael Mann / Omar Rivero*, Forum Claim No. 1741966; *Société Nouvelle Del Arte v. Domain Administrator, Domain Asset Holdings, LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2016-1859; *Pullmantur, S.A. v. Domain Asset Holdings, LLC, Domain Administrator*, WIPO Case No. D2015-0053; *WesTrac Pty Ltd v. Domain Asset Holdings, LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2014-2032; *Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc. v. Domain Asset Holdings*, WIPO Case No. D2013-1434; *Tracy Anderson Mind and Body LLC v. Domain Asset Holdings*, WIPO Case No. D2013-0699; *Universal Assistance S.A. v. Domain Asset Holdings, LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2012-2547; *Lifetime Assistance, Inc. v. Domain Asset Holdings, LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2011-2137; *Training Channel, S.A v. Domain Asset Holdings*, WIPO Case No. D2011-0875; *Facebook, Inc. v. Domain Asset Holdings,* WIPO Case No. D2011-0516.

Complainant thereafter requested that the Panel address the merits, noting its prior victories against Respondent, and Respondent's assertion that it did not admit the allegations of bad faith in the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

Complainant alleges, and the Registrar has verified, that Respondent Michael F Mann is the named registrant for all fifteen of the Disputed Domain Names. Respondent did not respond to the request for consolidation.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the Disputed Domain Names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, Respondent is the registrant of all of the Disputed Domain Names. Furthermore, Respondent has demonstrated its common control by responding to the Notice of Complaint and consenting to the transfer of all the Disputed Domain Names.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel approves the consolidation in a single proceeding of the disputes regarding all fifteen of the Disputed Domain Names.

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 Names. 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 each of the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names.

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 Names. 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 Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that on thirteen of the webpages where Respondent offers to sell Disputed Domain Names, Respondent asserts that the offered domain name is valuable because of the potential to association with Complainant or rideshare services. Respondent has no right to promote the sale of domain names based on their marketing potential to signal an affiliation with Complainant.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established with respect to all of the Disputed Domain Names except <uberinvestors.com> and <uberlove.com>. As noted above, the marketing statements for these two Disputed Domain Names do not reference the Mark or rideshare services and the Complaint does not offer alternative allegations or argument focused on these two Disputed Domain Names. As to these, the Panel finds that Complainant has not established[2] the second element of the Policy.

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.

The Panel finds that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith. Respondent was aware of and targeted the Mark. The Panel finds that Complainant is well known. Respondent undoubtedly has actual knowledge of the Mark when it registered the Disputed Domain Names.[3] It is also significant that Respondent was motivated to acquire these Disputed Domain Names because of their common component, namely Complainant's Mark.

The Panel also finds bad faith use of the Disputed Domain Names. As noted in the prior section, by emphasizing that buyers could use the Disputed Domain Name's in connection with ridesharing services, marketing the Disputed Domain Name based on their potential to generate commercial gain by confusing Internet users. This violates Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with respect to all of the Disputed Domain Names except two— <uberinvestors.com> and <uberlove.com> —which do not reference the Mark or rideshare services and the Complaint does not offer alternative allegations or argument focused

---

[2] To be clear, the Panel does not hold that Respondent has proved that it has rights or a legitimate interest in these domain names, but only that Complainant did not address these domain names and thereby carry its burden. The Panel is mindful that when disputes about multiple domain names are, as here, consolidated, argument and analysis is sometimes generalized in ways that overlook relevant distinctions.

[3] Although two of the Disputed Domain Names – <uberwald.com> and <uberway.com> – have creation dates that pre-date Complainant's oldest registration for the Mark, it appears (based on historical WhoIs records that identify registrants other than Respondent) that Respondent obtained each of these domain names in no earlier than 2023, and therefore after Complainant's oldest registration for the UBER Trademark. As set forth in section 3.8.1 of WIPO Overview 3.1: "Irrespective of the original creation date, if a respondent acquires a domain name after the complainant's trademark rights accrue, the panel will look to the circumstances at the date the UDRP respondent itself acquired the domain name."

on these two Disputed Domain Names. As to these, the Panel finds that Complainant has not 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 <bikeuber.com>, <uberalternative.com>, <ubercareers.com>, <uberclan.com>, <ubercontainers.com>, <uberinsurancepolicy.com>, <uberlimos.com>, <uberrestaurants.com>, <uberroadsideassistance.com>, <ubervegan.com>, <uberwald.com>, <uberway.com>, and <youruber.com> be transferred to Complainant pursuant to the Policy.

The Panel also orders that <uberinvestors.com> and <uberlove.com> be transferred to Complainant based on Respondent's statement that it "is willing to unconditionally transfer all of the Disputed Domains to Complainant as requested in the Complaint".

/Lawrence K. Nodine/
Lawrence K. Nodine
Sole Panelist
Date: October 27, 2026