

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jagex Limited v. Pali Dino, BattleScape
Case No. DIO2026-0001

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jagex Limited, United Kingdom (“UK”), represented Stobbs IP Limited, UK.

The Respondent is Pali Dino, BattleScape, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <battlescape.io> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 2, 2026. On January 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 6, 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 the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 6, 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 January 9, 2026.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on February 10, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a company organized under the laws of England and Wales. Founded in 2000, the Complainant is a videogame designer, developer and publisher. The Complainant has received critical acclaim throughout the world. Its most successful games are “Runescape” and “Old School RuneScape”. The latter was awarded with 2019 EE Mobile Game of the Year. Together on average both videogames attract more than 3 million users each month. Old School RuneScape has also been recognised by the Guinness World Records for being the largest free-to-play Massively Multiplayer Online Role-Playing Game with over 300 million accounts.

The Complainant owns a UK trademark registration for the figurative mark SCAPE, with registration number UK00004247316, with registration date November 21, 2025, and a UK trademark registration for the word mark RUNESCAPE, with registration number UK00002302308, with registration date December 27, 2002, both registered for services in class 41 for inter alia (video)game services.

In addition to this, the Complainant uses the mark SCAPE (on its own or in combination with other elements) in relation to its business activities, online presence, and in particular its music tracks.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 5, 2025. At the time of rendering this Decision and before, the disputed domain name resolved to a website inter alia offering the possibility to download and/or play a game. The website featured the title “battle scape” and “An Old School RuneScape private server”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

The Complainant’s has acquired substantial goodwill and reputation in the RUNESCAPE brand, as well as the individual elements of the mark, i.e., “rune” and “scape”. “scape” is in fact a colloquialism used by users and fans of the games offered by the Complainant to commonly refer to it. Such colloquial use is a convenient shorthand to refer to the brand in that regard.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark SCAPE, whereas it contains the dominant textual element of the Complainant’s figurative mark for SCAPE in its entirety, preceded by the descriptive term “battle”, which describes the gameplay activity within the Complainant’s videogames.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name for a website offering a pirated version of the videogame cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, as such illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Moreover, the Respondent is not commonly known by the name “scape” or “battle scape” and has not registered any similar exclusive rights to the disputed domain name.

In light of the fact that the Respondent is offering a pirated version of the Complainant's videogame for which it is also using the Complainant's copyrighted work and registered trademark rights, the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. This is strengthened by the fact that the Respondent has provided falsified details and is instead relying on a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's activities and registered trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website. In doing so, the Respondent is also disrupting the legitimate business of the Complainant.

Further to the above, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct targeting the Complainant, as it has previously registered the domain name <battle-scape.com> which resolves to an identical website also offering a pirated version of the Complainant's videogame.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition¹ ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The entirety of the mark SCAPE is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.10.

Although the addition of other terms here, the descriptive term "battle" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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 the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP 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

¹ In view of the fact that the Policy is in large part based on the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), it is well established that cases decided under the Policy and cases decided under the UDRP, and therefore [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), are relevant to this proceeding.

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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent 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 Policy or otherwise, i.e., being commonly known by the disputed domain name, notwithstanding that it has been registered under the organizational name "BattleScape" which merely attempts to give cover to an otherwise mala fide registration.

To the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to run a website on which it is apparently offering a pirated version of the Complainant's videogame. In doing so, the Respondent is prominently and frequently using the Complainant's copyrighted content and its registered trademarks.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: the sale of pirated software and other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its considerations under section 4.B above.

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 or use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to sell a pirated version of the Complainant's videogame and is clearly targeting the Complainant by referring on the home page to which the disputed domain name resolves, to the Complainant's game Old School RuneScape.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here the sale of counterfeit goods and fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the 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, <battlescape.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: February 16, 2026