

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

### **TOD for Advertising Production and Trade WLL v. Abdullah Al Mutairi Case No. DTV2026-0002**

#### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is TOD for Advertising Production and Trade WLL, Qatar, represented by Tmark Conseils, France.

The Respondent is Abdullah Al Mutairi, Saudi Arabia.

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

The disputed domain name <mytod.tv> 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 March 12, 2026. On March 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 12, 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 an email communication to the Complainant on March 16, 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 20, 2026.

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 March 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 12, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on March 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Gökhan Gökçe 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 wholly owned subsidiary of the Qatari company beIN Media Group LLC, a media group specializing in sports and entertainment broadcasting. Launched in January 2022, the Complainant operates a subscription-based over-the-top (“OTT”) streaming platform providing exclusive live and on-demand sports content in multiple languages, together with premium entertainment and original productions, available throughout the MENA region and Türkiye.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous TOD trademark registrations, including:

- the International Trademark Registration for TOD (word mark) No. 1643638, registered on October 4, 2021;
- the European Union Trade Mark Registration for TOD (word mark) No. 018568220, registered on January 27, 2022;
- the United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration for TOD (figurative mark) No. 361388 registered on October 6, 2021; and
- the Qatari Trademark Registration for TOD (figurative mark) No. 150875, registered on August 7, 2022.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name ,<tod.tv> which incorporates the TOD trademark and is used to host its OTT streaming platform.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 13, 2025.

According to Annex 3 to the Complaint, the disputed domain name <mytod.tv> resolved to an active website in Arabic offering sports-related content. The website prominently displayed the phrase “اشترك تود رخيص يشتغل ” بالسعودية” and appeared to promote access to the TOD service in Saudi Arabia, including live broadcasts of sports events. The website further contained references to various football competitions and terms in English, such as “Europa League”, “Premier League”, “Champions League”, “UEFA Champions League”, “Roshn Saudi League”, “mobile”, and “Full HD”, thereby conveying the overall impression of a commercial website offering access to sports broadcasting content.

As of the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website but instead displays a “404: NOT\_FOUND” error page.

#### **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 the Complainant’s trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations provided in the Complaint as true. See section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

For the evaluation of this case, the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

### 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "my", 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 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The addition of the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".tv" to the disputed domain name does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

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 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.

On the contrary, it results from the evidence on record that the Complainant’s TOD trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the TOD trademark or to register the disputed domain name incorporating this trademark.

There is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the entirety of the Complainant’s trademark with the ccTLD “.tv”, likely suggestive of “television”, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

To the contrary, the evidence on record indicates that, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant’s TOD figurative mark and purporting to offer subscription-based streaming services focused mainly on sports content. The website also featured the BEIN SPORTS trademark, owned by the Complainant’s parent company, beIN Media Group LLC, and contained no disclaimer or other indication that it was unaffiliated with the Complainant. In the Panel’s view, such use is manifestly not bona fide and cannot support any claim of rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent’s conduct demonstrates the Respondent’s knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant’s trademark. The use of the Complainant’s TOD logo makes it clear that the Respondent specifically knew of and targeted the Complainant. See *Fédération Française de Tennis (FFT) v. Daniel Hall, dotCHAT, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1941](#).

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant’s TOD figurative mark and purporting to offer subscription-based streaming services, primarily in relation to sports content. Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant’s TOD mark in its entirety together with the “.tv” ccTLD, carries a clear risk of implied association with the Complainant’s streaming and broadcasting services. This impression was reinforced by the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name for a website displaying the Complainant’s TOD figurative mark and the BEIN SPORTS trademark and purporting to offer subscription-based sports streaming services without any disclaimer of non-affiliation. Moreover, in light of the Complainant’s TOD

platform and its offering of sports and audiovisual content, the combination of the TOD trademark with the “.tv” ccTLD increases the likelihood that Internet users would expect the disputed domain name to be connected with the Complainant’s official streaming or broadcasting services (see *Channel Television Limited v. Legacy Fund LLC / Protected Domain Services Customer ID: R-3108040*, WIPO Case No. [DTV2011-0008](#)). The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent sought to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

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 <mytod.tv> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gökhan Gökçe/*

**Gökhan Gökçe**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2026