

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Belron International Limited v. mohsin ejaz

Case No. DAE2026-0013

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Belron International Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Gowling WLG (UK) LLP, United Arab Emirates.

The Respondent is mohsin ejaz, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <carglassuae.ae> is registered with AE Domain Administration (.aeDA).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 30, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to AE Domain Administration (.aeDA) a request for registrant verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 3, 2026, AE Domain Administration (.aeDA) 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 verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy for – UAE DRP approved by .aeDA (the “Policy”), the Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the “Rules”), and the Supplemental Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 3, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on August 5, 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 company established under the laws of England and Wales.

The Complainant is a leading vehicle glass repair and replacement group, operating in approximately 40 countries.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of trademark registrations for CARGLASS including United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration Numbers 247297 and 247298 in classes 12 and 37 respectively, that were filed on January 20, 2016, and registered on September 29, 2016.

In 2016, the Complainant entered into a franchisee deal with Al Nabooda Automobiles, the official distributor of Volkswagen, Porsche and Audi in Dubai and the Northern Emirates. As part of this arrangement, the Complainant's CARGLASS trademarks were used extensively in the United Arab Emirates, including on branded service vans, uniforms, and through sponsorships such as its sponsorship of the Global Hybrid Electric Challenge in the United Arab Emirates.

The Respondent did not file a Response, so little information is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 14, 2025.

At one time, the disputed domain name resolved to a website titled "CarGlass" that advertised windshield repairs in the United Arab Emirates under the CARGLASS trademark. This website did not identify the operator of the website but included a telephone number for Carglass Trading and Services (FZC). The Complainant states that this is a business that infringers the CARGLASS trademark and that one of its owners was the subject of a prior decision under the UDRP concerning the domain name <carglasstech.com> that was ordered to be transferred to the Complainant. See *Belron International Limited v. Ba Dembo Baldeh*, CAC-UDRP-106970.

On January 8, 2026, the Complainant's legal representative wrote cease-and-desist letters to the Respondent and to Carglass Trading and Services (FZC). No written response was received to these letters, although, according to the Complainant, Carglass Trading and Services (FZC) indicated via telephone communications that it does not intend to comply with the Complainant's demands.

Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to a Registrar-generated webpage that states: "Coming Soon New WordPress website is being built and will be published soon."

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions.

The CARGLASS trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and protects the Complainant's brand in connection with vehicle glass repair and replacement goods and services in the United Arab Emirates.

The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the CARGLASS trademark, or to register or use any domain name incorporating the CARGLASS trademark.

To the extent that the term "Carglass" is used by the Respondent or any business associated with the disputed domain name, such use is entirely unauthorized and infringing. It is well established that a respondent cannot acquire rights or legitimate interests through the unauthorized adoption of a complainant's trademark as a trade name or business identifier.

The disputed domain name is being used to promote an unauthorized business operating under the CARGLASS name in the United Arab Emirates, namely the business carried on through Carglass Trading and Services (FZC).

The website at the disputed domain name promotes identical vehicle glass repair and replacement services to those of the Complainant, is connected to the Infringing Carglass Trading and Services (FZC) business (for example, the website includes the contact telephone number for that business), and forms part of the broader infringing activity already carried out by the Carglass Trading and Services (FZC) business. The website at the disputed domain name does not reference or show any other connection to the Respondent, and so in consideration of the Respondent's entitlement to use the disputed domain name or incorporate the CARGLASS branding, it is clear the Respondent has no legitimate interest.

The "About Us" page on the website at the disputed domain name makes no reference to the Respondent, nor does any other page on this website. There are claims on the "About Us" page that the business originates "from Swedish roots" and that its team "leverages years of Swedish know-how", despite the fact it does not have any presence in Sweden.

Further, as highlighted above, the Carglass Trading and Services (FZC) business had already been subject to a cease-and-desist letter and a successful UDRP dispute brought by the Complainant. As such, the disputed domain name was clearly registered with prior knowledge of the Complainant's rights and CARGLASS trademark. This is reinforced by the Carglass Trading and Services (FZC) business also filing the current disputed domain name, in the name of a different registrant to the earlier case. This act of trying to disguise their involvement is clear evidence of bad faith.

The disputed domain name represents a continuation of the same infringing activity previously conducted via <carglasstech.com>. While the named registrant differs, the evidence demonstrates that the same underlying business is operating through the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 6(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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 has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. The Complainant's registered trademark is CARGLASS, and this mark is readily recognizable in the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms (here, "uae") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing

similarity between the disputed domain name and the CARGLASS mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the CARGLASS trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 6(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 6(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 proceedings under the Policy is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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.

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.

Although the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was previously used to advertise windshield repair services apparently offered by Carglass Trading and Services (FZC), and that the term “carglass”, while registered as a trademark by the Complainant, consists of two dictionary words that may be suggestive of such services, the Panel finds that the overall circumstances of this case support a finding that the Respondent targeted the Complainant’s trademark, and as such, the Respondent is found to have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In reaching this conclusion, the Panel emphasizes that the mere existence of a corresponding business name does not, by itself, confer rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. As noted in WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”)¹, section 2.12.2, panels have generally declined to recognize rights or legitimate interests based on a business registration where the surrounding circumstances indicate that the registration was obtained primarily to circumvent a complainant’s trademark rights or otherwise impede the complainant’s ability to enforce those rights.

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

C. Registered or is Being Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 6(a)(iii) of the Policy requires a demonstration that a domain name has either been registered or is being used in bad faith.

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith requires

¹ Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”), the Panel will, when appropriate, refer to the UDRP and apply UDRP jurisprudence, including reference to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”).

an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

The Panel has reviewed the Complainant's evidence and concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and used to promote a business in the United Arab Emirates that competes directly with the Complainant. The Panel notes that the Complainant's CARGLASS trademark had been in use in the United Arab Emirates for almost ten years before the registration of the disputed domain name, and concludes that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its CARGLASS trademark when registering the disputed domain name. In further support of this finding, the Panel notes that a prior domain name <carglasstech.com>, seemingly related to the disputed domain name, was registered to promote the business that competes with the Complainant and was the subject of a successful dispute brought by the Complainant under the UDRP in which a transfer decision was rendered months before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel considers that the disputed domain name was registered as part of the same scheme to promote that competing business while trading off of the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent did not participate in the proceedings and did not attempt to rebut the Complainant's evidence or allegations.

It is bad faith to register a domain name for the purpose of trading off the reputation of another's registered trademark.

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

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 6(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the domain name <carglassuae.ae> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Panelist

Date: August 13, 2026