

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Babbel GmbH v. Bhadhrika Nirmali Wijendrage
Case No. DCO2026-0017

1. The Parties

Complainant is Babbel GmbH, Germany, represented by Lubberger Lehment Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

Respondent is Bhadhrika Nirmali Wijendrage, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <babbel.co> is registered with Internetx GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 17, 2026. On February 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 23, 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 named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 23, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 23, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 18, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 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 was founded in 2007 and operates as an online language learning company. It runs one of the world's most used language learning applications and ranks among the top-selling platforms in its sector, with millions of app downloads and subscribers across more than 35 countries.

Its e-learning platform offers a comprehensive range of language learning resources, including a self-study app (Babbel), in-app games, a browser extension, and podcasts, as well as dedicated corporate language training services (Babbel for Business). The platform provides over 10,000 lessons in 14 different languages.

As shown in the examples below, Complainant owns the below trademark registration for the BABEL trademark, as well as domain names, such as <babbel.com> and <babbelforbusiness.com>.

Registration Number	Trademark	Jurisdiction	International Class	Registration Date
30770566		Germany	9, 16, and 41	March 13, 2008

The disputed domain name was registered on April 24, 2012 and redirects to a parked page displaying pay-per-click advertisements for language courses, including links to the websites of Complainant's competitors, and previously resolved to a parked page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name reproduces the BABEL trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".co", which must be disregarded. Therefore, according to Complainant, the disputed domain name is identical to Complainant's trademark, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Complainant affirms that it has not licensed or consented to the registration or use of the disputed domain name and that there are no circumstances that justify Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name. Also, Complainant argues that Respondent has not acquired a trademark for BABEL nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain name. Therefore, Complainant argues that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Complainant urges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to Complainant, considering the composition and use of the disputed domain name, Respondent must have been aware of Complainant's reputation and trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

Complainant further states that the disputed domain name was used by Respondent for advertising that trades on Complainant's trademark BABEL, by redirecting Internet users to websites offering competing

services. In this sense, it affirms the disputed domain name is being used to take advantage of the BABEL trademark to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion.

Thus, according to Complainant, the requirements for the identification of a bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy.

Accordingly, Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as follows:

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

The burden of proving these elements is upon Complainant.

Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the Complaint, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel's decision shall be based upon the Complaint.

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 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 BABEL trademark 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Also, the addition of the TLD ".co" must be disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

Therefore, based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on 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 Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Based on the available record, Respondent is not entitled to any trademark, trade name, or any other right associated with the disputed domain name. Additionally, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized by Complainant to use the BABEL trademark, and there is no commercial relationship between the Parties.

UDRP panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising pay-per-click links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9. In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that no rights or legitimate interests can be found on behalf of Respondent.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent has registered the disputed domain name that is identical to Complainant’s BABEL trademark. Also, based on the available record, it was established that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and its trademark, nor has it obtained authorization or a license to utilize the referred trademark. Also, Respondent does not own any trademarks containing the term “BABEL” or showed any rights over any related terms.

Respondent most likely knew or should have known of the existence of Complainant’s prior trademark rights and domain names, which were matters of public record, before registering the disputed domain name.

Considering Complainant’s activities, the composition of the disputed domain name and the manner in which it was used, it may be inferred that the registration and use of the disputed domain name was done with the intention to take unfair advantage of the BABEL trademark and attract Internet users for commercial gain.

As stated in the Complaint and shown in its annexes, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page with links to the websites of Complainant’s competitors. Previous panels have recognized that the use of parked pages with advertisement links may be evidence of bad faith, where such links are associated with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of Complainant’s trademarks. In this sense, see *GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES INSURANCE COMPANY v. Michael Gonzalez*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-1130](#). The prior passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

Therefore, based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 <babbel.co> be transferred to Complainant.

/Gabriel F. Leonardos/

Gabriel F. Leonardos

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026