ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Claridge's Hotel Limited v. Razin Rozman
Case No. DCO2026-0038

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Claridge's Hotel Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Murgitroyd & Company, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Razin Rozman, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <claridges.co> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 22, 2026. On April 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 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 amended Complaint on the same day.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 May 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Erica Aoki as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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 incorporated under the laws of England and Wales. The Complainant operates the world-renowned luxury hotel CLARIDGE'S in Mayfair, London, United Kingdom. The hotel has traded under the name CLARIDGE'S since at least 1856 and the Complainant has used the CLARIDGE'S mark continuously in connection with hotel services since its incorporation in 1889.

The CLARIDGE'S hotel is internationally recognized as one of London's most prestigious hotels and has acquired substantial goodwill and reputation over many decades. The hotel has been associated with royalty, heads of state, celebrities, and other distinguished guests. In 2025, CLARIDGE'S hotel was ranked among the world's leading hotels and has received numerous industry awards and recognitions.

The Complainant owns trademark rights in CLARIDGES and CLARIDGE'S, including, among others:

- United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. UK00001289153 for CLARIDGES, filed on October 1, 1986 and registered on May 12, 1989, in Classes 43 and 44.

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000648741 for CLARIDGE'S, filed on October 3, 1997 and registered on June 15, 1999, in Classes 16, 33 and 42.

These trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name and remain valid and in force.

The Complainant also owns and operates the domain name <claridges.co.uk>, which redirects Internet users to the Complainant's official website located at "www.maybourne.com/en/hotels/claridges".

The disputed domain name was registered on May 7, 2019. Registrar verification identified the Respondent as Razin Rozman of Malaysia. According to the record, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked webpage displaying sponsored links, including links referring to the Complainant and its hotel services.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its CLARIDGE'S trademark. The disputed domain name reproduces the CLARIDGE'S trademark in its entirety, differing only by the omission of the apostrophe, which is not technically capable of inclusion in a domain name. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is therefore identical, or at least highly similar, to its trademark rights.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has no business relationship with the Respondent, has never authorized the Respondent to use the CLARIDGE'S trademark, and is unaware of any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that the

disputed domain name resolves to a parked webpage displaying sponsored links, including links relating to the Complainant and its hotel services, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Third, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the longstanding reputation and fame of the CLARIDGE'S trademark, the Complainant argues that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name to create an unauthorized association with the Complainant and to attract Internet users for commercial gain by exploiting confusion with the Complainant's mark and reputation.

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

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

(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 and 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 (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated rights in the CLARIDGE'S trademark through its registered trademark rights.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's CLARIDGE'S trademark in its entirety. The omission of the apostrophe does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. As domain names cannot technically accommodate punctuation marks such as apostrophes, panels have consistently found that the removal of such punctuation is immaterial for purposes of the first element analysis.

The Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CLARIDGE'S trademark for purposes of the Policy (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7).

The country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".co" is generally disregarded for purposes of assessing confusing similarity under the first element (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CLARIDGE'S trademark.

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 a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests with the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may involve the difficult task of proving a negative, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. Accordingly, where a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating such rights or legitimate interests. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1).

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's CLARIDGE'S trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

According to the record, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked webpage displaying sponsored links, including links referring to the Complainant and its hotel services. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising pay-per-click ("PPC") links does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services where such links capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of a complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9).

Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's CLARIDGE'S trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor does it amount to legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii).

The Respondent has not submitted any Response or evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing or to demonstrate any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's CLARIDGE'S trademark is distinctive and enjoys a substantial reputation in connection with one of the best-known luxury hotels in London, United Kingdom. The Complainant's trademark rights long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. In light of the fame and longstanding use of the CLARIDGE'S mark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, differing only by the omission of the apostrophe, which cannot be represented in a domain name. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was deliberately chosen to target the Complainant and its trademark.

The record further shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a parked webpage displaying sponsored links, including links referring to the Complainant and its hotel services. Panels have consistently found that the use of a domain name confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark to host PPC links may constitute bad faith where the respondent seeks to capitalize on the goodwill associated with the complainant's mark (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.5).

In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the links displayed thereon. Such conduct constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent has failed to submit any Response or provide any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name. In the absence of any plausible good-faith explanation, the Respondent's failure to participate in the proceeding reinforces the inference of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <claridges.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Erica Aoki/
Erica Aoki
Sole Panelist
Date: June 19, 2026