

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Iqbal Khan S/O Abdul Majeed v. Sanjay Kumar Jha
Case No. D2026-4153

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Iqbal Khan S/O Abdul Majeed, India, self-represented.

The Respondent is Sanjay Kumar Jha, India, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mydpboss.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 16, 2026. On September 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 18, 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 sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 18, 2026, providing the additional registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar.

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 September 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 12, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on September 23, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center confirming his response on September 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Meera Chature Sankhari as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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, Iqbal Khan, is the registered proprietor of the DPBOSS trademarks, details of which trademark registrations are as follows:

1. Indian Trademark for DPBOSS (word mark), Registration No. 5893785 in class 42, dated April 15, 2023, in relation to “design and development of computer software and computer hardware; software-as-a-service; development services relating to computer software application solutions; development of softwares and websites related to number prediction, guessing and numerology; hosting of digital content online; hosting computer software applications of others; hosting an interactive website and online non-downloadable software for uploading, downloading, posting, showing, displaying, tagging, sharing and transmitting messages, comments, multimedia content, videos, movies, films, photos, audio content, animation, pictures, images, text, information, and other user-generated content”, and

2. Indian Trademark for  (device mark), Registration No. 6429182 in class 45, dated May 13, 2024, covers “Security guard services; Store security guard services; Security guarding for facilities; Security guard services for buildings; Providing information relating to security guard services; Intellectual property consultancy; Consultancy of spiritualists; Industrial property consultancy; Legal services; Mediation services [legal services]; Conveyance services [legal services]; Legal assistance services; Legal information services; Legal research services; Legal consultancy services; Social introduction agency services; Social escort agency services; Online social introduction services; Internet-based social networking services; Online social networking services accessible by means of downloadable mobile applications; Internet-based social networking, introduction, and dating services; Personal shopper services; Providing personal background check services; Personal growth and motivation consulting services; Identity verification services [personal background investigations]; Providing personal support services for cancer patients; Personal styling services consisting of bra measuring and fitting services; Personal and social services regarding individual needs; Social services rendered by others to meet the needs of individuals; Providing information, including on-line, relating to personal and social services rendered by others to meet the needs of individuals; Providing clothing to needy persons [charitable services]; Providing shoes to needy persons [charitable services]”, (together referred to as “DPBOSS marks”).

The disputed domain name <mydpboss.com> was registered by the Respondent, Sanjay Kumar Jha, on June 14, 2021, with the registrar PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com. The disputed domain name is an active domain name and appears to provide an online gambling platform associated with “Satta Matka” gambling, wherein the Respondent is offering daily live and fast gambling results along with accurate self-claimed charts, guessing tips, and lucky numbers to the online gamblers. The disputed domain name displays the mark “MyDPBOSS”, which appears similar to the Complainant’s subsequently registered DPBOSS marks along with some third-party adult apps advertisements.

The Respondent submitted its Response on September 23, 2026, and claimed that the Complainant has submitted this Complaint as an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking and requested that the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant be refused.

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 incorporates the distinctive and source-identifying trademark DPBOSS in its entirety and is identical to the Complainant's relevant trademarks.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no business relationship with the Complainant and has never been authorized, licensed, permitted, or otherwise consented to use or register the DPBOSS marks in any manner, including as part of a domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is neither commonly known by the name "DPBOSS" nor has the Respondent ever established any legitimate business identity or trademarks associated with the same. The Complainant argues that the Respondent does not have any legitimate rights or interests in the said mark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is operating an unlawful and illegal online gambling website through the disputed domain name, which is expressly prohibited in India under Section 5 of The Promotion and Regulation of Online Gaming Act, 2025. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to create confusion in the minds of public as to some association, affiliation, sponsorship, or endorsement with the Complainant's business and DPBOSS marks. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith to mislead Internet users, and unlawfully derive commercial gains by exploiting the goodwill and reputation attached with the Complainant's DPBOSS marks.

B. Respondent

The Respondent in its Response contends that the Complainant has initiated these proceedings having complete knowledge that the disputed domain name was created prior to the existence of the DPBOSS marks. The Respondent contends that the registration of the disputed domain name predates the Complainant's trademark rights in DPBOSS marks by approximately 3 years. The Respondent argues that the Complainant had applied for the registration of the trademark DPBOSS (word) in 2023 and later for its device mark in 2024, both of which are subsequent to the registration of the disputed domain name, which took place in 2021. The Respondent contends that it is legally impossible for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name in 2021 to target the Complainant's trademarks, which did not exist prior to 2023. The Respondent contends that there is a substantial mismatch in the class and nature of the trademark and the disputed domain name and that its online platform does not compete with or tarnish any physical security services of the Complainant.

The Respondent further alleges that the Complainant has not satisfied the third element required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent further contends that in accordance with paragraph 15(e) of the Rules, the Complainant's complaint constitutes an abuse of the administrative process and an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant is the owner of the DPBOSS marks dating back to 2023 and 2024,

respectively. It is undisputed that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's DPBOSS marks. The Panel observes that the disputed domain name was registered on June 14, 2021, predating the Complainant's 2023 and 2024 trademark registrations by approximately two and three years, respectively.

That said, as per section 1.1.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), "Although the UDRP makes no specific reference to the date on which the holder of the trademark or service mark acquired its rights, such rights must be in existence at the time the complaint is filed. The fact that a domain name may have been registered before a complainant has acquired trademark rights does not by itself preclude a complainant's standing to file a UDRP case, nor a panel's finding of identity or confusing similarity under the first element. However, where a domain name has been registered before a complainant has acquired trademark rights, only in exceptional cases would a complainant be able to prove a respondent's bad faith."

Needless to mention, the Complainant in this case must prove the Respondent's bad faith in order to succeed in these proceedings.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In addition to the Panel's finding under the third element that the Complainant has failed to establish that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, it would appear that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

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 evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name in bad faith targeting the Complainant or its trademark rights because the Complainant had no trademark rights at the time that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered on June 14, 2021, approximately two years before the Complainant's 2023 word mark registration and approximately three years before its 2024 device mark registration. The Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark registrations postdate the registration of the disputed domain name and that nothing in the case file indicates that the Complainant had used the DPBOSS mark before June 14, 2021, or that the Respondent knew or could reasonably have known of the Complainant or any intended use of that mark when registering the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name to target the Complainant or its trademark rights. The Panel does not find bad faith in the registration of the disputed domain name. Having found that the disputed domain name was not registered in bad faith, the Panel need not address the Complainant's allegation that the Respondent's activities are illegal under Indian law and is a question best dealt with by a court of competent jurisdiction.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

The Panel makes the following observations, which have no bearing on its finding that the third element has not been established, based on the Complainant's contentions, the documents submitted during the proceedings, and the website at the domain name <dpbosse.net>, which was transferred to the Complainant in *Iqbal Khan v. Express Now, Venture Marketplace*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2588](#):

- i) the Complainant's trademark registrations cover a range of services, including, in class 45, security guard services, legal consultancy services, and Internet-based social networking services;
- ii) the Complainant's *dp^{BOSS}* device mark and the "MyDPBOSS" branding on the Respondent's website use a nearly identical pink color for the first two letters and black for the remaining letters; and
- iii) the Panel visited the Complainant's website at "www.dpbosse.net" and observed that the services offered and the website's look and feel were identical to those of the Respondent's website.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success in the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

As noted in the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), "Panels have more recently clarified that, for an RDNH finding to be made, it is not necessary for a respondent to seek an RDNH finding or prove the presence of conduct constituting RDNH." Furthermore, some of the reasons articulated by panels for finding RDNH include: "(i) facts which demonstrate that the complainant knew it could not succeed as to any of the required three elements – such as the complainant's lack of relevant trademark rights, clear knowledge of respondent rights or legitimate interests, or clear knowledge of a lack of respondent bad faith (see generally section 3.8) such as registration of the disputed domain name well before the complainant acquired trademark rights,..."

The disputed domain name was registered on June 14, 2021, before the Complainant obtained its trademark registrations for DPBOSS in 2023 and 2024. Nothing in the case file indicates that the Complainant had begun using the DPBOSS mark before the disputed domain name was registered, or that the Respondent knew or could have known of any intended use of the mark by the Complainant. The Complainant has neither explained nor alleged how the Respondent could have been aware of the Complainant, its business, or its claimed trademark rights at the time of registration, particularly given that those rights postdate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel acknowledges that the apparent similarities in the parties' use of the color pink give it some pause. Nevertheless, there is no evidence in the case file establishing how the Respondent could have known of the Complainant or its subsequently acquired trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. In these circumstances, the Complainant should have appreciated that it could not establish that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. The Panel therefore finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding.

For all the aforesaid reasons, the Panel finds that the Complaint has been brought in bad faith and constitutes an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Meera Chature Sankhari/

Meera Chature Sankhari

Sole Panelist

Date: October 28, 2026