ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Iqbal Khan S/O Abdul 20Majeed v. Dharmsingh Meena
Case No. D2026-4184

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Dharmsingh Meena, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dpboss.media> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 17, 2026. On September 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On 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 (Unknown Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 21, 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 22, 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder as the sole panelist in this matter on October 19, 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 an individual based in Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India.

The Complainant is the proprietor of two Indian trademark registrations. The details are as below:

- Registration No. 5893785 for DPBOSS registered on April 15, 2023, in Class 42.
- Registration No. 6429182 for Dp BOSS (device) registered on May 13, 2024, in Class 45.

The Complainant has not filed evidence of the use of any of these marks. Further, the Complainant has made no assertions as to the business he carries on, or the goods or services in connection with which he uses, or intends to use, the DPBOSS marks. From an online search, the Panel notes that DPBOSS is a highly popular online platform in India that serves as an information aggregator for Satta Matka, a form of lottery and gambling originally based on betting on the opening and closing rates of cotton transmitted from the New York Cotton Exchange.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 6, 2026. The Registrar disclosed the registrant as Dharmsingh Meena, an individual with an address in Jaipur, Rajasthan, India. The disputed domain name resolves to a website titled "!! Welcome to Dpboss Media !! Satta Matka Fast Result".
The logo " Dp boss Media " displayed on the website consists of a stylised magenta "Dp" in script followed by the words "boss Media" in black. The Respondent's website publishes results and charts for satta matka markets, offers guessing tips, and explains how bets are placed on matka numbers.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that he 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 reproduces his DPBOSS mark in its entirety and is identical to it. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no relationship with him, has not been authorized to use the mark, and is not commonly known by the name "DPBOSS". The Complainant states that under Indian law, gambling is prohibited under Section 5 of the Promotion and Regulation of Online Gaming Act, 2025, and argues that such illegal use of the disputed domain name does not confer rights or legitimate interests. The Complainant further contends that there is no business connection or relationship with the Respondent, and the Complainant has not consented to the Respondent's use of his word or device mark in any manner. The Complainant further states that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name to take unfair advantage of the goodwill in the mark, creating a false impression of association with the Complainant, in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The three elements that the Complainant must establish in order to obtain the remedy of transfer of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are:

i. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
ii. The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
iii. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent.

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 adduced evidence of its trademark registrations for the DPBOSS mark. 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 entirety of the DPBOSS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".media" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.11.1.

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 Complainant has asserted that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, arguing that: (i) The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's DPBOSS trademark; (ii) The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; (iii) The Respondent is operating an online gambling website through the disputed domain name which is prohibited under Section 5 of the

Promotion and Regulation of Online Gaming Act, 2025; and (iv) The Complainant has not consented to the use of his mark in any manner by the Respondent.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent's website offers an online money game prohibited by section 5 of the Promotion and Regulation of Online Gaming Act, 2025, and that illegal activity cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13. In the Panel's view, whether the Respondent's website is unlawful under the Promotion and Regulation of Online Gaming Act, 2025 is a question best dealt with by a court of competent jurisdiction, and this UDRP Panel is not the appropriate forum to decide it. It is a settled principle that where a dispute between the parties exceeds the relatively limited "cybersquatting" scope of the UDRP, it is more appropriately addressed by a court of competent jurisdiction. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.14.6.

Independently of the alleged illegality, the Complainant's submissions that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, together with the Respondent's commercial use of a domain name that is identical to the Complainant's mark for a website trading as "Dpboss Media", support the Panel's finding that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 2.1 and 2.5.1.

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 the Complainant's DPBOSS mark was registered on April 15, 2023, more than three years before the disputed domain name was registered on June 6, 2026. The disputed domain name incorporates the mark in its entirety. The Respondent's website uses the name DPBOSS MEDIA as its own brand throughout and offers number guessing and prediction content. Both parties are in India. In these circumstances, the Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration.

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 Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name for a website that trades under the name DPBOSS and promotes an application of the same name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to his website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the logo on the Respondent's website reproduces the stylized "Dp" in magenta and black lettering of the Complainant's registered DPBOSS device mark. The Respondent's adoption of the Complainant's device, and not merely his word mark, indicates that the Respondent had the Complainant's mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <dpboss.media> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Shwetasree Majumder/
Shwetasree Majumder
Sole Panelist
Date: October 30, 2026