

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tebex Limited v. Ninja Store, Vinod Patel
Case No. DIO2025-0025

1. The Parties

Complainant is Tebex Limited, United Kingdom, internally represented.

Respondents are Ninja Store, India and Vinod Patel, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <cfx-tebex.io> is registered with Sav.com, LLC.

The disputed domain names <fivem-tebex.io> and <store-tebex.io> are registered with Dreamscape Networks International Pte Ltd (the “Registrars”).

These three disputed domain names are hereafter referred to collectively as the “Disputed Domain Names”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 4, 2025. On July 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On July 7, and 9, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names, which differed from the named Respondent (PRIVATE REGISTRY AUTHORITY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 9, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. 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 .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 6, 2025. A Response was filed with the Center on August 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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.

Preliminary Procedural Rulings

Late Filed Response

Respondent Ninja Store filed a Response on August 7, 2025, which was one day after the due date. The Panel exercises its discretion to consider the late Response.

Consolidation

“Where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario.” WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.11.2¹.

The three Disputed Domain Names are under common control. Respondent Ninja Store is the registrant of two of the Disputed Domain Names – <store-tebex.io> and <fivem-tebex.io>. The registrant of the third Disputed Domain Name <cfx-tebex.io> is Vinod Patel, whose email address reflects a connection with Respondent Ninja Store. Respondents Vinod Patel and Ninja Store each used the same physical address in Gujarat India when they registered the Disputed Domain Names. Moreover, the late Response was sent by the Respondent Ninja Store via contact details confirmed by the concerned Registrar for the Disputed Domain Names <store-tebex.io> and <fivem-tebex.io>, but regarding the third Disputed Domain Name <cfx-tebex.io>. This evidence persuades the Panel that the three Disputed Domain Names are under common control. The Panel finds that consolidation would be fair and equitable, and, accordingly, approves the consolidation.

For the remainder of this decision, the Panel will refer to the two named Respondents as simply “Respondent” (singular).

4. Factual Background

Some video games, such as Grand Theft Auto, are so popular that developers create modifications (“Mods”) that enhance these games. For example, FiveM is a modification for Grand Theft Auto V enabling one to play multiplayer on customized dedicated servers, powered by Cfx.re. “Cfx.re” refers to the development team that built the FiveM platform².

Complainant was incorporated in the United Kingdom on July 4, 2012. Since at least November 2019, Complainant has used TEBEX (hereinafter the “Mark”) as an unregistered service mark in connection with its business, which provides service to independent developers who create mods and scripts using platforms such as FiveM. Complainant also sells mods, scripts, and other in-game items to gamers globally. In particular, Complainant offers scripts that it develops to enable independent developers to monetize their mods and scripts. The headline on a screenshot of Complainant’s 2019 website boasts, “We help thousands of servers just like yours make money from in-game monetisation.”

¹ Given the similarities between the .IO Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”), the Panel finds UDRP precedent to be relevant to this case. See *LinkedIn Corporation v. DNS Admin, Botflip LLC*, [DIO2022-0005](#).

² The Panel visited <fivem.net> on August 20, 2025.

Complainant does not own a trademark registration for the Mark, but Respondent admits (in its response) that Complainant's services are "widely used in the FiveM and game modding community." Complainant offers evidence, which Respondent does not dispute, that unrelated third parties frequently use the Mark on various websites to refer to Complainant.

On its website at <tebex.io>,³ Complainant offers to sell its services and code. Starting in 2019 (if not earlier), Complainant displayed a stylized version of the Mark on its webpage, which was comprised of two shades of blue:



Complainant recently changed the style of the Mark and the color layout of its website.

On May 23, 2025, Complainant prevailed in *Tebex Limited v. Vinod Patel*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1368](#), a UDRP proceeding against one of the two Respondents named in the instant case. That case involved the domain name <tebex.store>. The panel found that Complainant had rights in the unregistered mark TEBEX.

The Disputed Domain Names in the present case were registered as follows:

- <cfx-tebex.io>, registered November 29, 2022;
- <fivem-tebex.io>, registered March 21, 2024;
- <store-tebex.io>, registered December 9, 2024.

All three of these websites associated with the Disputed Domain Names display Complainant's Mark in the style that Complainant adopted in 2019. The websites also use the layout and colors that Complainant adopted in 2019. Like Complainant, Respondent offers services and products (mods and scripts) to the gaming community via its three websites.

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 Names.

B. Respondent

Respondent denies that it acted in bad faith and contends that it was not aware of Complainant's trademark rights, noting that Complainant does not have a trademark registration. Respondent also contends that it only meant to make referential or descriptive use of Complainant's Mark.

³ Complainant owns at least ten domain names that include the Mark as a component.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Like the prior panel in *Tebex Limited v. Vinod Patel*, supra, this Panel finds Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. Complainant's evidence demonstrates that independent third parties recognize Complainant's Mark as a single specific source of services. And Respondent admits that the Disputed Domain Names "were chosen to reference compatibility with or usage of Tebex services, which are widely used in the FiveM and game modding community." See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.3 ("The fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant's mark [e.g., based on the manner in which the related website is used] may support the complainant's assertion that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier.")

The entirety of the Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, each of the Disputed Domain Names is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of additional terms ("store", "cfx", and "fivem") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names and the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 Names.

Although the overall burden of proof in 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. 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 Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Respondent asserts that "the domains were chosen to reference compatibility with or usage of the Tebex services, which are widely used in the FiveM and game modding community." Respondent further asserts that it meant to use Complainant's Mark "in a descriptive or referential way."

All three websites associated with the Disputed Domain Names tell a different story. Rather than good faith "referential" use, all three websites reflect deliberate impersonation of Complainant. Complainant's stylized version of the Mark-



(complete with “TM” in superscript) is displayed on the top banner of all three of the websites associated with the Disputed Domain Names. At least, the website at <fivem-tebex.io> includes “© 2025 Tebex. All rights reserved.” All three websites mimic the layout and color scheme that Complainant used until very recently – a color scheme and layout with which potential customers are likely still familiar.

The text on Respondent’s websites evidences an intent to impersonate Complainant:

“Welcome to Tebex, the leading destination for all your FiveM and RedM needs.” and “At Tebex, we focus on delivering the best tools [...]”. (Displayed on both the <cfx-tebex.io> and the <store-tebex.io> websites.).
“Welcome to Tebex Customer Support” (Displayed on the <fivem-tebex.io> website).

This evidence demonstrates that Respondent is not merely referring to Complainant; it is claiming to be Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Although paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the .IO Policy, unlike the UDRP, requires that Complainant prove bad faith registration or (not “and”) bad faith use, the Panel is persuaded that Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith.

The Panel finds that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith. Respondent asserts that it did not know that Complainant had any registered trademark rights but admits that it deliberately targeted Complainant with full awareness that Complainant’s services were “widely used in the FiveM and game modding community.” Respondent plainly knew that TEBEX was widely recognized as a specific single source of services and Respondent sought to exploit that consumer awareness and deceive Internet users when it registered the Disputed Domain Names.

Respondent contends that it only meant to make fair reference to Complainant. For the reasons set out in the prior section, the Panel is not persuaded and instead finds that Respondent targeted and impersonated Complainant intentionally “to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location. of confusing Internet users for commercial gain.” See .IO Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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 Names, <cfx-tebex.io>, <fivem-tebex.io>, and <store-tebex.io>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: August 25, 2025