ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Omaze, Inc. v. Roderick Daez
Case No. D2026-4190

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Roderick Daez, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <omazeuk.com> 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 (https://www.hostinger.com/whois?domain=omazeuk.com&view=contact) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 22, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 22, 2026.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on October 26, 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 partners with, and raises money for charities in the US and the UK via its competitions. The Complainant was established in the US in 2012 and launched in the UK in 2020.

The Complainant is the registered proprietor of a global portfolio of trade mark registrations, including the following UK and US trade mark registrations:
• UK trade mark registration no. 801391303 for OMAZE, registered on August 3, 2018;
• US trade mark registration no. 4320140 for OMAZE in classes 35, 41 and 42, registered on April 16, 2013;
• US trade mark registration no. 7870710 for OMAZE in class 9, registered on July 22, 2025;

The Complainant owns the domain names <omaze.com> (registered on December 23, 2006) and <omaze.co.uk> (registered on January 20, 2019) (the Omaze Domains) and operates its primary website at these domains.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on May 5, 2026 and is currently parked.

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 contains the word 'OMAZE / omaze', which is identical to the Omaze Mark, in combination with the non-distinctive initialism 'uk', which is one of the Complainant's key locations and home of the registered office of the Complainant's related company Omaze UK Limited. The likelihood of internet users confusing the Disputed Domain Name and any website hosted at such domain with the Complainant's Omaze Mark is therefore inevitable.

To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent is not known by the Disputed Domain Name (save for any false association with the Complainant). The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, approved or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name, or to operate a website hosted at such domains in any capacity.

Given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Omaze Mark in full and in combination with a descriptive, non-distinctive element that is closely associated with the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name could never be used for any legitimate purpose (whether non-commercial or fair use) by any party other than the Complainant. Any third-party use would inevitably confuse visitors to any website hosted at the Disputed Domain Name into believing that such domain name is registered to, operated or authorized by, or otherwise connected with the Complainant.

It is clear that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, intending not only to benefit from the Complainant's reputation and goodwill in the Complainant's Omaze Mark and the Omaze brand generally, but to misappropriate the valuable intellectual property of the Complainant and to falsely create the impression of an association with the Complainant. The Respondent will never be capable of using the Disputed Domain Name for a legitimate purpose, as members of the public will assume that there

is an association between the Respondent and the Complainant, when there is not. Any use of the Disputed Domain Name to host a website would, at the very least, cause initial interest confusion because a visitor to any such website would, based on the Disputed Domain Name alone, visit such website on the expectation that it is the official website of the Complainant (irrespective of whether the user is subsequently disabused of that notion or not).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated that it has registered trademark rights in the OMAZE Mark. The addition of the term "uk" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1").

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has presented a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that the Respondent obtained the Disputed Domain Name which incorporated Complainant's United Kingdom and United States registered OMAZE trademark and merely adds the geographic abbreviation "uk" indicates that the Respondent likely sought to piggyback on the mark for illegitimate reasons, namely, to engage in a phishing scheme targeting customers of the Complainants.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.,* WIPO Case No. D2003-0455.

Here, the Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Name was registered over a decade after Complainant first used its OMAZE marks. The evidence provided by Complainant makes it clear that Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's OMAZE marks and likely knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name when he decided to register it.

Moreover, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

The Panel finds that the only plausible basis for registering and using the Disputed Domain Name is for illegitimate and bad faith purposes. In addition, in view of section 3.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the current inactive state of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding particularly noting the reputation of the OMAZE mark, composition of the Disputed Domain Name clearly targeting the OMAZE mark, and lack of response from Respondent.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <omazeuk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/
Colin T. O'Brien
Sole Panelist
Date: November 9, 2026