ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Express Newspapers v. Investagama EOOD
Case No. DIE2026-0001

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Express Newspapers, United Kingdom, represented by Hansel Henson Limited, United Kingdom.

The Registrant is Investagama EOOD, Bulgaria, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dailystar.ie> is registered with IE Domain Registry Limited ("IEDR").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 19, 2026, via email. On January 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to IEDR a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 20, 2026, IEDR transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Registrant is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IE Dispute Resolution Policy (the "IEDR Policy"), the WIPO Dispute Resolution Rules of Procedure for .IE Domain Name Registrations (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2.1 and 4.1, the Center formally notified the Registrant of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on January 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5.1, the due date for Response was February 25, 2026. The Center received an email communication from the Registrant in response on February 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on February 13, 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 has published the Irish Daily Star in Ireland since 1988. This is an Irish version of its Daily Star newspaper in the United Kingdom.

In November 2025, the average daily circulation of the Irish Daily Star in Ireland was approximately 15,600 copies.

The Complainant owns:

- an Irish trade mark No. 225283 for DAILY STAR IRELAND, registered on September 5, 2002, in class 16; and
- a European Union Trade Mark No. 003776309 for IRISH DAILY STAR, registered on September 20, 2005, in classes 9, 16 and 41.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.dailystar.co.uk”.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 28, 2024.

As of January 5, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to an Ireland-focused news and information website with a “DAILY STAR IRELAND” logo, and which included extensive gambling advertisements.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

B. Registrant

The Registrant contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all of the elements required under the IEDR Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Registrant contends that:

- the Registrant is a content publishing company that operates news and information websites in multiple countries;
- the Registrant’s primary focus is on identifying new markets where there is demand for high quality content tailored to local and international audiences;
- several years ago, the Registrant acquired the Daily Star Lebanon news platform at “www.dailystar.com.lb”, which formed the basis for the Registrant’s brand expansion strategy;
- the Registrant launched a website at the disputed domain name to provide news and related content to Irish and European readers, having chosen Ireland due to its growing influence, English-speaking population, and position as a gateway to the European Union market;
- the Registrant is aware that common terms such as “daily,” “star,” “news,” “post,” and “Irish” are frequently used in the naming conventions of media outlets in Ireland and elsewhere, including “well-known publications” like the Irish Daily Star, Daily Mirror, and others;
- the Registrant’ s selection of “Daily Star Ireland” / “Daily Star IE” for the website was not intended to copy, impersonate, infringe upon or cause confusion with any existing brands, but was simply a natural extension of its existing Daily Star Lebanon operations, aiming to build on an established brand while adding value through localised content;
- such connection can be verified by comparing the similarities between two sites;
- the Registrant does not produce printed editions; and

- the Registrant has a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name as part of its bona fide business expansion, and there is no evidence of bad faith registration or use, such as an intent to disrupt competitors or mislead consumers.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a protected identifier in which the Complainant has rights

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for misleading similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's protected identifier and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1")[1], section 1.7.

Under paragraph 1.3.1 of the IEDR Policy, "protected identifiers" include "trade and service marks protected in the island of Ireland". The Complainant owns the above-mentioned European Union Trade Mark for IRISH DAILY STAR, which has effect within Ireland and which therefore constitutes a protected identifier for the purpose of the IEDR Policy.

A dominant feature of the above trade mark, namely the term "daily star", is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the IEDR Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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

B. Rights in Law or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 3 of the IEDR Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a registrant may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in IEDR Policy proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised that proving a registrant 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 registrant. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the registrant lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the registrant 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 registrant fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

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

As to paragraph 3.1.1. of the IEDR Policy, and as further discussed in section 6C below, the Panel disagrees with the Registrant's assertion that it has used the disputed domain name in connection with a "bona fide business expansion"; rather the Panel has found that the Registrant intentionally attempted to create confusion with the Complainant's mark. Such use of the disputed domain name is not bona fide.

---

[1] Although WIPO Overview 3.1 is directed to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), given the similarity between the UDRP and the IEDR Policy, it is appropriate to have regard to these principles except to the extent that the IEDR Policy diverges from the UDRP.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 3.1.2 or 3.1.3 of the IEDR Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

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

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 1.1.3 of the IEDR Policy, paragraph 2 of the IEDR Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration or use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel considers that the Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating confusion with the Complainant's mark in accordance with paragraph 2.1.4 of the IEDR Policy.

First, the Registrant has admitted that it was aware of the Irish Daily Star as one of the "well-known" news publications in Ireland.

Second, the disputed domain name comprises the term "daily star" along with the .ie domain name suffix denoting Ireland and is therefore liable to be confused with the Complainant's newspaper/mark.

Third, the Registrant's website is branded "DAILY STAR IRELAND", which reflects the Registrant's Irish registered trade mark, mentioned above in Section 4, and is being used for the same kind of news and information services as those supplied by the Registrant.

The Panel rejects the Registrant's claim that the website at the disputed domain name is a legitimate extension of its Daily Star Lebanon website. The Panel acknowledges that the two websites are similar in term of branding and design. Nonetheless, the Panel considers that, by registering the disputed domain name, and by applying an Irish version of its Daily Star Lebanon model to the website at the disputed domain name, more likely than not the Registrant intended to create confusion with the Complainant's longstanding and admittedly well-known Irish publication – i.e., irrespective of the legitimacy or otherwise of the Daily Star Lebanon website.

Nor does it assist the Registrant that it does not produce printed editions of its publication. This fact by no means indicates that the Registrant was not seeking to create confusion on the part of users seeking the Complainant's publication online.

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

7. Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 5 of the IEDR Policy and 14 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <dailystar.ie> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/
Adam Taylor
Sole Panelist
Dated: March 5, 2026