ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
X Corp. v. Mark Zahide
Case No. D2026-4297

1. The Parties

Complainant is X Corp., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Polsinelli PC, United States.

Respondent is Mark Zahide, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <awaited-x.com>, <capacity-x.com>, <centre-x.com>, <challenges-x.com>, <clarification-x.com>, <complaints-x.com>, <compromised-x.com>, <concerned-x.com>, <conducts-x.com>, <conduct-x.com>, <decree-x.com>, <demands-x.com>, <denial-x.com>, <determination-x.com>, <disclosure-x.com>, <dismissal-x.com>, <disputes-x.com>, <exception-x.com>, <faqterms-x.com>, <filing-x.com>, <formal-x.com>, <guidance-x.com>, <highlights-x.com>, <incident-x.com>, <instructions-x.com>, <judgments-x.com>, <judgment-x.com>, <legals-x.com>, <locals-x.com>, <monetization-x.com>, <moved-x.com>, <petition-x.com>, <precedent-x.com>, <proceed-x.com>, <reachability-x.com>, <recognition-x.com>, <recognize-x.com>, <remark-x.com>, <repurposes-x.com>, <speech-x.com>, <temporarys-x.com>, <testimonials-x.com>, <unreachable-x.com>, <validity-x.com>, <violance-x.com>, <violates-x.com>, and <warrant-x.com> (the "Domain Names") are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 23, 2026. On September 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On September 25, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 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. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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

Complainant alleges:

"Complainant owns and operates a well-known and indeed famous online social networking platform and mobile application (the 'X Platform'), which it has offered under its 'X' trademark since as early as September 2023."

"Complainant's X Platform has been referred to as the 'global town square,' where the public gathers to live its life in real-time. The X Platform is both a technology platform and telecommunications service where registered users can upload, view and share information, images, photos, audio, video, entertainment and other content by publishing public posts, private messages, and in other online communities or groups. The X Platform continues to be the top platform for curious and influential people worldwide, who use it daily to follow their passions, especially during important moments."

"Through extensive distribution and advertising and because of the high quality of its products and services, Complainant has generated substantial goodwill and customer recognition in the famous X trademark."

"Complainant maintains a publicly accessible website through which its technology services are offered at the domain 'www.X.com.'"

Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark X in many jurisdictions, including the United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and Saudi Arabia. One such registration is United States Reg. No. 8,368,938 for the design mark X, registered on July 28, 2026 in connection with, among other things, "computer software platforms, downloadable, for use in enabling internet users to post, upload, view, and share data, information and multimedia content", with a July 2023 date of first use in commerce. Complainant also owns European Union Reg. No. 018928961 for the word mark X, registered on October 11, 2024.

The Domain Names were registered between April 21, 2026 and July 13, 2026. According to Complainant:

"The Disputed Domain Names are one front of a coordinated, ongoing phishing operation. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names to trade on a false association with Complainant and in order to impersonate Complainant and to engage in phishing attempts and other fraudulent activity. The Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, licensed to use Complainant's famous brand 'X' (in any form), or licensed to register or use any domain name incorporating the X mark." […]

"The operation deploys these domain names in email phishing to hack the accounts of Complainant's customers. Impersonating Complainant, the actors send messages engineered to look like Complainant's official communications—fake 'policy violation,' 'DMCA notice,' and 'appeal' notices—often adding an artificial deadline (for example, a warning that an account will be suspended unless the recipient acts within a stated number of hours) to pressure the recipient into acting before scrutinizing the message. The emails carry links to web pages hosted at, or reached through, the Disputed Domain Names. Those pages are built to spoof Complainant's genuine login and appeal pages—the same layout, typography, color scheme and X

logo—so that a customer who follows the link is deceived into entering the account credentials and the one-time two-factor authentication (2FA) codes that the pages are designed to harvest. With those credentials and codes, the operation takes over the victims' X accounts in real time." […]

"The spoofed pages share a common template and a common favicon and website fingerprint that recurs across the campaign's domains." […]

"The Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Names to divert Complainant's customers to web pages that impersonate Complainant, for the purpose of harvesting login credentials and 2FA codes, defrauding those customers, and hacking into their accounts. When the Respondent redirects traffic through intermediary proxies and spoofed pages, it makes a non-legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Names, misleadingly diverting consumers from Complainant's official website to phish and defraud."

Included in the Complaint are examples of messages sent by Respondent to X users, together with a screenshot of a web page under the Domain Name <disputes-x.com>. Both the message and the web page feature Complainant's X logo. The web page purports to be the X "Help Center". Complainant also states that some of the Domain Names do not presently resolve to active websites.

Respondent has not disputed any of the foregoing allegations or challenged any of Complainant's evidence.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Names.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to each of the Domain Names:

(i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
(ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
(iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel concludes that Complainant has rights in the trademark X through registration and use demonstrated in the record.

The Panel also finds that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's mark. The Domain Names incorporate the X mark and add a generic term before the mark. In each instance, despite the additional term, the Panel finds that Complainant's X mark is recognizable within the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

For each of the Domain Names, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

(i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
(ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
(iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. Respondent has not come forward to dispute Complainant's allegations and evidence, including the serious allegation that Respondent is engaged in a far-flung scheme to impersonate Complainant in aid of a fraudulent phishing scheme. On this undisputed record, the Panel finds that such conduct cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent.

The Panel concludes that Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

For each of the Domain Names, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation", are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in "bad faith":

(i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
(ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
(iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
(iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel concludes, on this undisputed record and on a balance of probabilities, that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Names in bad faith. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the "Rights or Legitimate Interests" section.

The record supports the finding that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of targeting the famous X trademark in order to impersonate Complainant and run a phishing scam on unwitting consumers who believe that they are communicating with Complainant's consumer help center. Such conduct constitutes bad faith registration and use within the meaning of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

In addition, the Panel finds that Respondent's registration of 47 Domain Names incorporating Complainant's X mark constitutes a pattern of preclusive registrations, and hence bad faith registration and use within the meaning of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(ii). The shared naming structure, registration within

approximately three months, and documented impersonation under <disputes-x.com>, considered together, further support the inference of a common abusive purpose across the Domain Names.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of Complainant's trademark, the composition of the Domain Names, the circumstances described above, and Respondent's failure to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the inactive Domain Names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 Domain Names <awaited-x.com>, <capacity-x.com>, <centre-x.com>, <challenges-x.com>, <clarification-x.com>, <complaints-x.com>, <compromised-x.com>, <concerned-x.com>, <conducts-x.com>, <conduct-x.com>, <decree-x.com>, <demands-x.com>, <denial-x.com>, <determination-x.com>, <disclosure-x.com>, <dismissal-x.com>, <disputes-x.com>, <exception-x.com>, <faqterms-x.com>, <filing-x.com>, <formal-x.com>, <guidance-x.com>, <highlights-x.com>, <incident-x.com>, <instructions-x.com>, <judgments-x.com>, <judgment-x.com>, <legals-x.com>, <locals-x.com>, <monetization-x.com>, <moved-x.com>, <petition-x.com>, <precedent-x.com>, <proceed-x.com>, <reachability-x.com>, <recognition-x.com>, <recognize-x.com>, <remark-x.com>, <repurposes-x.com>, <speech-x.com>, <temporarys-x.com>, <testimonials-x.com>, <unreachable-x.com>, <validity-x.com>, <violance-x.com>, <violates-x.com>, and <warrant-x.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/
Robert A. Badgley
Sole Panelist
Date: November 5, 2026