

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) v. wendao liu  
Case No. DIO2025-0049

### 1. The Parties

Complainant is Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), Switzerland, represented by K&L Gates, Australia.

Respondent is wendao liu, China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fifacoin.io> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 17, 2025. On November 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On November 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 19, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on November 19, 2025. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 24, 2025.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 24, 2025. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on December 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on January 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**

Complainant is the world governing body of the sport of football and the organizer of the FIFA World Cup, FIFA Women's World Cup, FIFA Club World Cup and FIFA Beach Soccer World Cup, among other international football tournaments. Complainant operates a worldwide commercial program with FIFA partners, sponsors and tournament supporters, among others, and maintains a licensing program with official licensees. In consideration for their valuable support of the soccer tournaments, Complainant grants exclusive marketing, media, and other commercial rights associated with the tournaments to its official affiliates. Such rights include the use of FIFA and tournament specific trademarks, copyrighted material, trade dress, logos, slogans, and other FIFA owned intellectual property.

Complainant operates in a four-year cycle, with the FIFA World Cup being the event in the fourth year, which is the main source of the organization's revenues. Such FIFA revenues come from the sale of television broadcasting, marketing and licensing and hospitality rights and ticket sales. For the 2019-2022 financial period, FIFA revenue totaled USD 7.6 billion.

Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks for the FIFA mark, including:

- International Trademark Registration No. 633108 for FIFA word mark, registered on February 22, 1995, with priority from November 8, 1994, based on Swiss Trademark Registration No. 415299;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 2352934 for the FIFA word mark, registered on May 30, 2000, with priority from November 8, 1994, based on Swiss Trademark Registration No. 415299; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 747778 for FIFA word mark, registered on June 2, 2000, with priority from December 9, 1999, based on Swiss Trademark Registration No. 471848 and is protected under various designations, including China.

Complainant also owns and operates the domain name <fifa.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on March 8, 2025, and at the time of filing of the Complaint, resolved to a website offering the Domain Name for sale for USD 20,189.85.

The Center issued a Notice of Registrant Information on November 19, 2025. On November 19, 2025, Respondent sent an email to the Center and Complainant's representatives, which roughly translated as "Hello, we don't know that this domain name will be controversial, we contacted dynadot.com registrar to delete this domain name, but because this domain name is locked, it cannot be deleted. This domain name can be deleted directly or transferred to you by dynadot.com, because we do not know the situation of this domain name, and we do not need this domain name, thank you."

On November 21, 2025, Complainant responded to Respondent's email and requested that Respondent sign a standard settlement form providing that Respondent agree to transfer the Domain Name to Complainant. Complainant sent a follow up email on November 24, 2025. No response was received from Respondent.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for FIFA and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known FIFA products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes Complainant's trademarks, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

Accordingly, Complainant requests transfer of the Domain Name to Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant's contentions. However, Respondent did send an email to the Center and Complainant's representatives on November 19, 2025, indicating that Respondent attempted to delete the Domain Name but was unable to do so, and that Respondent did not need the Domain Name.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **.IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy**

The Policy has substantive and procedural similarities to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"). Accordingly, UDRP decisions and the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), are appropriately relevant to this dispute involving the .IO country code Top-Level Domain: see *Instagram, LLC v. Imran Khan*, WIPO Case No. [DIO2024-0019](#).

The requirements under the Policy are:

- (i) The 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 domain name; and
- (iii) The domain name has been registered or 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

The Panel further finds that Complainant's FIFA Trademark is clearly recognizable within the Domain Name and that the addition of the term "coin" after the FIFA trademark in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and Complainant's FIFA trademark for the purposes of the .IO Policy. Compare [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel finds that 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 proceedings under the Policy 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.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, likely aware of Complainant and its FIFA trademarks, and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. In addition, Complainant asserts that Respondent is not an authorized reseller and is not related to Complainant. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the FIFA trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

Furthermore, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name redirected a webpage that offered the Domain Name for sale at USD 20,189.85. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and cannot under the circumstances confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Moreover, the nature of the Domain Name, including Complainant’s FIFA trademark and the term “coin” reinforced its association with Complainant’s business and products, is misleading and carries a risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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, despite the fact that Respondent had informally noted that Respondent attempted to delete the Domain Name and the Domain Name was not needed.

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

## **C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith**

Unlike the UDRP, which requires that Complainant prove both bad faith registration and use, under the Policy, it is sufficient for Complainant to prove either registration or use of the Domain Name is in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name was registered in bad faith. The Panel finds that Complainant’s trademark is famous worldwide and that Respondent likely knew of and targeted Complainant when he registered the Domain Name. Respondent has not offered any good faith justification for the registration of the Domain Name.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the FIFA trademarks long predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant’s FIFA trademarks and related products and services

are widely known and recognized. In addition, the addition of the term “coin” to Complainant’s trademark in the Domain Name implies affiliation to Complainant’s sports industry and business activities. Therefore, Respondent was likely aware of the FIFA trademarks when it registered the Domain Name, and knew, or should have known, that the Domain Name was confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2; see also *TTT Moneycorp Limited v. Privacy Gods / Privacy Gods Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1973](#).

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent’s awareness of Complainant’s trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Even though not required by the Policy, the Panel also finds bad faith use based on the fame and distinctiveness of Complainant’s trademark and Respondent’s offering of the Domain Name for sale at USD 20,189.85. The Panel considers that the price indicated for the Domain Name, likely in excess of out-of-pocket costs, derives from its significance in connection with the FIFA trademark. Compare [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1.

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 Domain Name <fifacoin.io> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Kimberley Chen Nobles/*

**Kimberley Chen Nobles**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 19, 2026