

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Formula One Licensing BV v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC  
Case No. DME2025-0034

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Formula One Licensing BV, Netherlands (Kingdom of the) (the “Netherlands”), represented by Sheridans Solicitors, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC.<sup>1</sup>

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <f1box.me> is registered with Immaterialism Limited (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 3, 2025. On December 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 4, 2025, 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 (f1box.me c/o 1337 Services LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 5, 2025, 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 December 10, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform 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 December 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 5, 2026

---

<sup>1</sup>The Panel notes that the Registrar Immaterialism Limited did not confirm the location of the registrant of the disputed domain name.

The Center appointed Anne-Virginie La Spada as the sole panelist in this matter on January 14, 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 Dutch company based in Rotterdam, the Netherlands, which is the owner of all the trademarks related to the F1 Championship. The F1 Championship was established in 1950, and the races are broadcast in over 180 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of various F1 trademarks worldwide. The Complainant provided a full listing of marks registered in jurisdictions around the world, including the following:

- International registration no. 1436310 registered on August 9, 2018, in classes 3, 6, 8, 11, 20, 21, 29, 30, 37, 42, and 43 and designating various countries including the United Kingdom and China; and
- International registration no. 1360007 registered on February 17, 2017, in classes 4, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 25, 28, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, and 41 and designating various countries including the United Kingdom and China.

The Complainant registers or acquires, directly or through related companies, domain names including the F1 trademark such as <f1box.com> or <f1paddock.com>. The Complainant also authorizes licensees to register or use domain names comprising the F1 trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 12, 2022.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the F1 trademark - notably in a "F1Box Streams" logo - and providing free video streams of the F1 Championship races, under the heading "Watch Free Live F1 Streaming Online".

#### **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 that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known registered trademark F1. The addition of the word "box" is not sufficient to create significant differences between the disputed domain name and the trademark. On the contrary, the word "box" is a common racing term that further associates the disputed domain name with the Complainant and the F1 Championship.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant to use the disputed domain name and there is no indication that the Respondent is known by it. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services since the Respondent displays the Complainant's trademark on the website associated with the disputed domain name, as well as unauthorised video streams of F1 and other races. This suggests an attempt to imply affiliation with the Complainant, and exploit the goodwill and distinctive value of the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes an intentional attempt to benefit unlawfully from the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant and its

trademarks. This creates the false impression of an affiliation, endorsement or partnership with the Complainant, misleading consumers into believing that such a relationship exists when it does not.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant must assert and prove each of the following:

- (i) the domain name registered by the respondent 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 registered by the respondent 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.

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 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](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "box") 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 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.

Based on the information submitted by the Complainant, the Complainant has not granted the Respondent authorization to use its trademarks within the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Based on the evidence provided by the Complainant, it appears that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website that reproduces the Complainant's well-known trademark F1 and offers free streams of Championship F1 races, without any broadcast authorisation. This creates the impression of an official website operated, or at least endorsed, by the Complainant.

According to UDRP panels, a respondent's use of a domain name is not to be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Finally, the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complaint. The Panel may draw from the lack of a Response the inferences that it considers appropriate, according to the Rules, paragraph 14(b).

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

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

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant's trademark had been registered. In light of the Complainant's longstanding use of their trademark and the circumstances surrounding the use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it highly improbable that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name without the Complainant's trademark in mind. The Complainant also points out that the term "box" is a term in racing terminology, as it refers to the instruction to racing drivers in F1 Championship to move their cars to the pit lane (the service area of which is called the "box"). This circumstance also supports a finding that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademark in mind when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent finally used as contact address the details of an anonymous domain name hosting platform named Njalla Okta LLC, which clearly suggests an intention to hide its identity.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

In addition, the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a website that reproduces the Complainant's trademark and hosts unauthorised sports video streams, in particular F1 video streams. This creates the false impression that the Respondent's website is operated or endorsed by the Complainant and that it offers official or authorized content, when such is not the case. Consequently, the Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name in this manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source and affiliation of its website. This constitutes use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <f1box.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Anne-Virginie La Spada/*

**Anne-Virginie La Spada**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026