

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

REBEL WOLVES SPÓŁKA Z OGRANICZONĄ ODPOWIEDZIALNOŚCIĄ v.

Yang zec, UESTC

Case No. DCC2025-0013

1. The Parties

The Complainant is REBEL WOLVES SPÓŁKA Z OGRANICZONĄ ODPOWIEDZIALNOŚCIĄ, Poland, represented by Olesiński i Wspólnicy spółka komandytowa, Poland.

The Respondent is Yang zec, UESTC, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thebloodofdawnwalker.cc> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 2, 2025. On July 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 3, 2025, 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 (Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 4, 2025, 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 July 8, 2025.

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 July 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent's default on July 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on August 7, 2025. 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 the creator of video games, including a forthcoming game called “The Blood of Dawnwalker.” It is the proprietor of numerous trademark registrations, including the following:

- European Union Trade mark No. 018616201 for DAWNWALKER (word mark), registered on April 12, 2022, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 21, 25, 28, 38, 41, 42, and 45;
- International Trademark No. 1847031 for THE BLOOD OF DAWNWALKER (device mark), registered on December 13, 2024, for goods and services in classes 9, 14, 16, 21, 25, 28, 38, 41, 42, and 45;
- European Union Trade mark No. 019119604 for THE BLOOD OF DAWNWALKER (device mark), registered on April 14, 2025, for goods and services in classes 9, 14, 16, 21, 25, 28, 38, 41, 42, and 45.

The Complaint notes that the Complainant uses the domain name <bloodofdawnwalkergame.com> to promote the game.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 14, 2025. At the time of this Decision, it did not resolve to an active website. The Complaint notes that it previously resolved to a website featuring an embedded video of the trailer of “The Blood of Dawnwalker” game above the text “The Blood of Dawnwalker” and a button labeled “Download Game.” The website also included text describing the game. The copyright notice stated “2024 The Blood of Dawnwalker All rights reserved”. The website provided the following notice to Internet users:

“The Service and its original content (excluding Content provided by You or other users), features and functionality are and will remain the exclusive property of the Company and its licensors. The Service is protected by copyright, trademark, and other laws of both the Country and foreign countries. Our trademarks and trade dress may not be used in connection with any product or service without the prior written consent of the Company.”

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 its video game “The Blood of Dawnwalker” was first publicized on December 16, 2024, and its trailer published on January 13, 2025. The game has generated significant attention and the trailer has at least 5 million views. The disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant’s mark in its entirety, was registered the day after the trailer was published. It resolved to a website that features the Complainant’s mark and images from its copyrighted marketing material. The website purported to permit Internet users to download the game, which is not yet available. The website included a link to the Complainant’s own website and a copyright notice referencing “The Blood of Dawnwalker.” There was no disclaimer clarifying the lack of relationship between the Parties. Instead, the Respondent’s website asserted rights in trademarks and images that are not its own.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

While the UDRP makes no specific reference to the date on which the holder of the trademark or service mark acquired its rights, for purposes of the first element, such rights must be in existence at the time the complaint is filed. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.1.3. The Panel notes that the Complainant's marks were registered at the time of filing the Complaint.

The entirety of the Complainant's THE BLOOD OF DAWNWALKER mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 3.0](#), 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.

Following established UDRP practice, the Panel will assess claimed respondent rights or legitimate interests in the present, i.e., with a view to the circumstances prevailing at the time of the filing of the complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 2.11.

The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's THE BLOOD OF DAWN WALKER mark. Therefore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name.

The available facts do not support a finding that the Respondent operated a genuine noncommercial fan website or was engaged in other noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The website does not disclaim the relationship between the Parties. It purports to invite Internet users to download a video game, which indicates commercial activity. The copyright notice identifies the website operator as "The Blood of Dawnwalker", and the terms and conditions on the Respondent's website indicate that the Respondent is the owner of the content and trademarks on the site. Such use is inconsistent with noncommercial or fan site use that could support under specific circumstances a finding of rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5.3. and 2.7.2.

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 Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant registered its DAWN WALKER mark more than two years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The registration of the disputed domain name occurred one day after the publication of the trailer for "The Blood of Dawnwalker" video game. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark. Coupled with the timing of the registration, the Panel finds that the available evidence supports a finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel notes that the Respondent's website contains images from the Complainant's own website and purports to offer Internet users the opportunity to download the video game. The website identifies the copyright holder as "The Blood of Dawnwalker" and does not disclaim the relationship with the Complainant. Coupled with the lack of respondent rights or legitimate interests, in particular and the lack of evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name as a genuine noncommercial fan site, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 <thebloodofdawnwalker.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: August 21, 2025