ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Camelot Holdco4 (Jersey) Limited, Silverchair Science & Communications, LLC v. payment services
Case No. D2026-4169

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Camelot Holdco4 (Jersey) Limited and Silverchair Science & Communications, LLC, United States of America, represented by Lily Garcia Walton, United States of America.

The Respondent is payment services, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mcmanuscriptcentarl.com> is 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 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 and other domain name. On September 17 and September 21, 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 (Disputed Domain Name(s): mcmanuscriptcentarl.com and manuscripcentral.com) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on September 22, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainants to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint and withdrew the claims against the other domain name on September 25, 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 October 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 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

Silverchair Science & Communications, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, operates the ScholarOne Manuscripts and ManuscriptCentral platform under license from Camelot Holdco4 (Jersey) Limited. Camelot Holdco4 (Jersey) Limited is the holder of the relevant trademarks. The two companies are entities under common ownership and control within the Silverchair group of companies and will be referred to in the singular (the "Complainant"). The two companies share a common grievance against the Respondent.

According to the Complainant, it has since at least as early as 2000 operated the ScholarOne Manuscripts and ManuscriptCentral manuscript submission and peer-review platform hosted at the website "www.mc.manuscriptcentral.com", which is used by researchers, editors, and reviewers across the scholarly publishing industry on behalf of scholarly journal publishers and associations.

The Complainant's trademark relevant to the present dispute is:

MANUSCRIPT CENTRAL, United Kingdom registration number UK00003694664, registered December 17, 2026, in the name of Camelot Holdco4 (Jersey) Limited, in class 41.

The Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <mc.manuscriptcentral.com>.

No background information is available about the Respondent, except for the street address and telephone number in Pakistan, and email address, as were furnished to the Registrar at the time of registration of the disputed domain name on May 5, 2026. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and returns a message that the page cannot be displayed. The disputed domain name is however configured for email use. The Complainant has undertaken a detailed technical investigation of the disputed domain name and states that it has full outbound email authentication with Sender Policy Framework ("SPF"), Domain-based Message Authentication, Reporting, and Conformance ("DMARC") and DomainKeys Identified Mail ("DKIM") set.

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 identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark except for a transposition of letters within the trademark word "central" to become "centarl" in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is thereby typosquatting on the Complainants domain name <mc.manuscriptcentral.com> and MANUSCRIPT CENTRAL trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the

disputed domain name. The Complainant has not granted to the Respondent any license or authorization to allow the use of the Complainant's trademark. There is no evidence the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or is making any legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of it.

The Complainant says the disputed domain name impersonates that of the Complainant's manuscript submission platform. Technical analysis of the Respondent's configuration of the disputed domain name, including its SPF, DMARC and DKIM settings, shows that it is set up with the potential to be used for phishing purposes. In particular, the totality of the configuration means that the disputed domain name can be used to send outbound mail that passes SPF and DKIM authentication checks at a receiving mail server. This does not represent a legitimate interest in a domain name that is in conflict with the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant further contend that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. As background, the Complainant says there is a history of impersonators attempting to extract payment from clients by means of spurious article processing charges. The name "payment services" adopted by the Respondent is consistent with a fraudulent operation.

The Complainant asserts in effect that the disputed domain name is passively held and submits that the non-use of a domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The Complainant says or implies that its trademark has the requisite distinctiveness or reputation, that there is no evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, and that potential good-faith use would be implausible. Together with the misspelling of the Complainant's trademark and the configuration of the disputed domain name with MX, SPF, and DKIM records, enabling the sending of authenticated emails, this amounts to the disputed domain name having been registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

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 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. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.9.

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.

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

C. Registered and Used 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.

The Complainant has based its case under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy on the doctrine of passive holding (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3) and the assertion that the disputed domain name is passively held.

Prerequisite is to determine whether the disputed domain name is indeed passively held since it has been configured for potential use as an email address.

The Complainant is to be commended for the presentation of a detailed technical analysis titled "Evidence of Impersonation, Technical Configuration and Hosting Cluster Analysis", with a list of sources from which the disclosed data can be verified. Among other information, the document lists the value settings for SPF, DMARC, and DKIM, also evidence of other publishing-related domain names attributable to the same IP address as the disputed domain name, and evidence of certificate bundling including the disputed domain name.

The Complainant then explains the technical conclusions that can be drawn from each of these settings, together with inferences and conclusions that should not be assumed.

The Complainant's chief conclusion is "... that this configuration establishes that the domain name has been prepared to send email which will survive authentication checks at the recipient, in the name of a string differing from the Complainants' service hostname by the omission of a dot and the transposition of two letters". In other words, that the Respondent appears to have set out deliberately to ensure that messages impersonating the Complainant by means of the disputed domain name are likely to reach their destination.

This enables the Panel to determine the key question of whether the domain name is passively held. The Respondent has not merely configured the disputed domain name for email purposes but has applied expertise to attempt potentially to defeat security filters. Nevertheless, capability of use is not use. There is no evidence the disputed domain name has been used for emails.

In order for bad faith to be found under the doctrine of passive holding a panel needs to evaluate the totality of the circumstances in each case. The Panel has in mind the principles enumerated in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, which principles are not part of the Policy, but have been referred to in innumerable cases since.

The Panel notes that:

i) The Complainant's trademark is distinctive.

(ii) The disputed domain name is deceptively similar to the Complainant's trademark except for the addition of the term "mc" and the transposition of the letters "ra" to become "ar", and is deceptively similar to the Complainant's domain name except for the same transposition and the omission of a dot after "mc".

(iii) The Respondent has not submitted a response or provided evidence of any good faith use or intended good faith use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent.

(iv) The Respondent has done more than mere registration of the disputed domain name with a blank website and a basic MX record, by establishing certain security-defeating procedures.

(v) The Panel cannot conceive of any potential use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be in conflict with, and be likely to result in confusion with, the Complainant's trademark.

As observed by the Panelist in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, "... the relevant issue is not whether the Respondent is undertaking a positive action in bad faith in relation to the domain name, but instead whether, in all the circumstances of the case, it can be said that the Respondent is acting in bad faith". The examples of bad faith listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are "without limitation" and bad faith may be found otherwise by the Panel.

On the totality of the foregoing evidence and on the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intended to target specifically the Complainant. The Panel finds the Respondent to have registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of 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 <mcmanuscriptcentarl.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman/
Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman
Sole Panelist
Date: November 4, 2026