

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jagex Limited v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. DIO2026-0006

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <elkoy.io> is registered with Immaterialism Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 26, 2026. On February 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 11, 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 and contact information in the Complaint (Unknown / REDACTED). The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 12, 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 March 16, 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 March 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 10, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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 video games designer and publisher established as a limited company under the laws of England and Wales in 2000. Its Massively Multiplayer Online Role-Playing Games (“MMORPG”) RuneScape and Old School RuneScape average a total of more than three million active users per month since October 2022. Old School RuneScape has also been recognized by Guinness World Records for being the largest free-to-play MMORPG with over 300 million accounts. (The games are evidently available in free-to-play versions supported by advertising or by paid subscription.) The Complainant operates these games and related activities online at “www.runescape.com” and linked websites and social media sites with hundreds of thousands of followers, as documented in the Complaint and attachments. The Complaint documents substantial media and industry recognition of the Complainant’s RuneScape games over the years, in the United Kingdom and internationally.

A central NPC (“non-player character”) in both the RuneScape and Old School RuneScape games is the gnome Elkoy, introduced in 2002 and continuing to the present. The character’s background and personality are detailed in Runescape Wikis, excerpts of which are attached to the Complaint. It appears that this NPC was redesigned in 2011 and much is frequently discussed, as Elkoy serves as a guide for players through one of the villages and mazes in the games.

The Complainant holds United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00004271161 for ELKOY as a word mark, registered on December 19, 2025, in international classes 9 and 41. The Complainant applied for this mark on September 29, 2025.

The disputed domain name was created on November 18, 2024, and is registered to the Respondent “Host Master” of Njalla Okta LLC, showing a postal address in Charlestown, Saint Kitts and Nevis and the contact email address “[xxx]@njal.la”. According to its website at “www.njal.la”, Njalla is a “privacy as a service” company based in Costa Rica, offering domain registrations, hosting, and virtual private network (VPN) services, with a “fetish for privacy”. Thus, it is likely that the disputed domain is registered by the Respondent on behalf of an underlying registrant whose identity has not been disclosed.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. However, the Complaint attaches a screenshot of the website formerly associated with the disputed domain name, which was headed “Elkoy” followed by this message: “Welcome to Elkoy. What are you waiting for? Join the fun and start your adventure today!” The page presented a “Download” button, and the site allowed visitors to download what the Complainant states was a pirated copy of the Complainant’s Old School RuneScape game, (a copyright violation in breach of the Complainant’s end-user license agreement [“EULA”] for the game, attached to the Complaint).

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is identical to its recently registered ELKOY word mark and also appears to assert prior common law protection for the mark, without explicitly saying so. The Complainant simply refers to “development and use” of the ELKOY mark over the past 24 years. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no permission to use the mark and no other rights or legitimate interests in it; to the contrary, the Respondent has used it only to distribute a pirated copy of the Complainant’s game, which cannot be deemed a legitimate interest.

The Complainant argues that this conduct also reflects bad faith for Policy purposes, as does the Respondent's subsequent passive holding of the disputed domain name and its pattern of abusive domain name registrations (the Complainant observes that the Respondent has been named in over 50 domain name disputes resulting in transfer orders).

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.¹

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered ELKOY word mark), which is sufficient to establish standing. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. This mark is incorporated in its entirety in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds on this record that the ELKOY mark was likely protectible at common law for some years before trademark registration, certainly by the time of the registration of the disputed domain name in 2024, due to the longstanding use of the character name in the Complainant's names and surrounding media. This finding is not necessary for the first Policy element but is relevant to the third element, bad faith.

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 ioDRP 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 3.1](#), 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, the record shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to

¹Taking into consideration many similarities between the .IO Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistent with the consensus views captured therein.

distribute what appeared to be a pirated copy of one of the Complainant's copyrighted games in which the ELKOY character figures. This illegal or illegitimate activity cannot be considered the exercise of rights of legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

The Panel finds that the second element of the Complaint has been established.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a showing of bad faith in either the registration or use of the disputed domain name. There is no question here that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and targeted the ELKOY mark, as the website formerly associated with the disputed domain name offered downloads of an unauthorized copy of one of the Complainant's games in which the ELKOY character is featured.

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 and use of a domain name in bad faith. One of these, paragraph 4(b)(iv), seems apt in this case: intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark in an effort to attract Internet users to another site for commercial gain. In any event, using the disputed domain name for a site purporting to allow downloads of the Complainant's copyrighted material without permission must clearly be deemed a bad faith use within the meaning of the Policy, no matter what the commercial terms of the downloads. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal or illegitimate activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. ²

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 <elkoy.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/
W. Scott Blackmer
Sole Panelist
Date: April 21, 2026

²The Complainant cites as well the Respondent's "pattern" of abusive registrations as an indication of bad faith. As noted above, the Panel observes that the Respondent is a registrar and hosting service that likely registered the disputed domain name on behalf of an unidentified customer, so it is probable that the Respondent's customer is responsible for the illicit use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has, however, avoided identifying that customer, whose bad faith may be inferred from its efforts to avoid identification and its failure to respond to the Complaint and other communications in this proceeding.