

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jagex Limited v. Ryan Dennis

Case No. DIO2026-0002

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jagex Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Ryan Dennis, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <scaperune.io> 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 January 22, 2026. On January 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 23, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent email communications to the Complainant on January 27, 2026, and February 3, 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 February 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 February 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 2, 2026. The Respondent sent email communication to the Center on February 20, 2026.

On March 2, 2026, the Complainant requested the suspension of the proceedings. On March 3, 2026, the Center confirmed that the proceeding is suspended until April 2, 2026. On March 19, 2026, the Complainant

requested the reinstitution of the proceeding. On March 20, 2026, the Center reinstituted the proceeding. On March 23, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a Response. The Center notified the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on March 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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 British video game developer and publisher incorporated in 2000. It designs, publishes and operates online video games and other electronic-based entertainment. The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <runescape.com> since 2000. One of the games offered by the Complainant is Old School RuneScape¹, announced in 2013. The webpage for this game on the Complainant's website displays the header:



The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for RUNE SCAPE and RUNESCAPE (jointly, the "RUNE SCAPE trademark"), including the following representative registrations in the United States, where the Respondent is located:

– the United States trademark RUNESCAPE (word) with registration No. 2829952, registered on April 6, 2004, for goods and services in International Classes 16, 25, and 41; and

– the United States trademark  (combined) with registration No. 3373023, registered on January 22, 2008, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 16, 25, and 41.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 28, 2023. It is currently inactive and displays the text: "We're currently undergoing maintenance and will be back shortly". At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that offered video games and displayed the following header:



The Respondent's website also copied other elements of the Complainant's webpage for Old School RuneScape, included a "Downloads" section and a link to a profile on YouTube² with the same header, and displayed the copyright notice "This website and its contents are copyright © 2015 - 2022 ScapeRune".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

¹ See <https://oldschool.runescape.com/>.

² See <https://www.youtube.com/@ScapeRune/featured>.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its RUNESCAPE trademark, because it incorporates the trademark's elements "rune" and "scape" in inverted order, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant points out that the website at the disputed domain name copies the Complainant's logo and uses copyright-protected content from the Complainant's webpage for its game OldSchool RuneScape. The Complainant adds that the Respondent has engaged in a sustained campaign targeting the Complainant's games and business, including through the operation of similar websites at the domain names <scaperune.net>, <scaperune.info>, and <scaperune.org>, which contained the same copyright-protected content from the Complainant's websites and which now redirect to the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant notes that its RUNESCAPE trademark significantly predates the registration of the disputed domain name, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any of its parts, and that it is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent of or commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers. Rather, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a website that offers a pirated version of the Complainant's Old School RuneScape game.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, the Respondent was well aware of the RUNESCAPE trademark and of the Complainant's RuneScape and Old School RuneScape games. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is free riding on the goodwill of the RUNESCAPE trademark, because the website at the disputed domain name promotes a pirated copy of the Old School RuneScape game and copies the design and content of the Complainant's official Old School RuneScape webpage, thus impersonating the Complainant and disrupting its business.

B. Respondent

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

In its informal communication to the Center, the Respondent stated:

"I write to confirm that I consent to the transfer of the domain name scaperune.io to the Complainant.

I wish to note the following for the record:

- The domain was transferred to my GoDaddy account by a third party who asked me to hold it on their behalf. I did not register the domain originally, nor was I involved in selecting the domain name.
- The domain was only in my possession for a brief period of approximately three months prior to this proceeding. To the best of my knowledge, the original owner held the domain for years before transferring it to me.
- To the best of my knowledge, the original owner registered the domain, created all associated content, made all financial investments in the domain and hosting, and operated any website or service associated with it. My involvement was limited solely to temporarily holding the domain in my account at their request.
- I was not involved in the creation, development, or operation of any website or service hosted at the domain.
- I have not made any financial investment in the domain, hosting, or any associated services.
- I was not aware of the nature of the dispute or the potential trademark implications at the time the domain was transferred to me. Had I understood that accepting this transfer would expose me to legal proceedings, I would not have agreed to it.

I have no interest in retaining this domain, and I have no objection to it being transferred to the Complainant. I respectfully request that this proceeding be concluded accordingly."

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel notes that the Policy is similar to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP”) with the notable exception that the third element requires a complainant to establish either registration or use in bad faith in order to succeed. The Panel will therefore refer to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”) where appropriate.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the RUNE SCAPE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

As discussed in section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), a domain name that consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark. Under the second and third elements, panels will normally find that employing a misspelling in this way signals an intention on the part of the respondent (typically corroborated by infringing website content) to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant. Examples of such variations include, inter alia, the inversion of letters and numbers, and plays on the mark (e.g., abbreviations or combinations of select elements of the mark).

The Panel finds the RUNE SCAPE trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, because the two elements “rune” and “scape” are incorporated there in inverse order, and the disputed domain name appears as an intentional variation of the trademark.

In addition, it appears from the content of the website at the disputed domain name that the Respondent seeks to target the RUNE SCAPE trademark through it, as further discussed in the section that follows. This confirms the confusing similarity between the Complainant’s RUNE SCAPE trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.15.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the RUNE SCAPE trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests and Registered or Used in Bad Faith

As noted in section 2.15 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), in some cases panels assess the second and third UDRP elements together, for example where clear indicia of bad faith suggest there cannot be any respondent rights or legitimate interests. In such cases, panels have found that the facts and circumstances of the case would benefit from a joint discussion of the policy elements. The Panel considers this to be so here.

Although the overall burden of proof is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that 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 3.1](#), 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. Rather, it claims that an unidentified third party is the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name, denies any involvement in the operation of the associated website, and states that it has no interest in retaining it.

The disputed domain name appears as an intentional variation of the Complainant's distinctive RUNE SCAPE trademark, and has been used for a website that copied the design and content of the Complainant's webpage for the Old School Rune Scape game, including the logo, claiming the copyright, and effectively impersonated the Complainant. The Respondent does not deny that the website offered for download a pirated version of the Complainant's game. Its allegation that a third party is the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name and has set up the associated website is not supported by evidence and the Respondent has not even identified the alleged third party. The Panel is not persuaded by this allegation, and finds that the Respondent is the party that is responsible for the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (here, claimed copycat website, passing off as the Complainant, and distribution of pirated software) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, and constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.13.1 and 3.4.

Considering the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that the second and the third elements of the Policy have 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 <scaperune.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026