

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jaguar Land Rover Limited v. Wonder M

Case No. DTZ2025-0002

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jaguar Land Rover Limited, United Kingdom, represented by CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Wonder M, United Republic of Tanzania.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <landroverfestival.co.tz> is registered with the Tanzania Communications Regulatory Authority (the “TCRA”, or the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 23, 2025. On October 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the TCRA a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 10, 2025, the TCRA 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. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 11, 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 November 11, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Domain Name Dispute Resolution Guidelines (the “Guidelines”), approved by the TCRA, and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Domain Name Dispute Resolution Guidelines for .tz (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with paragraph 8.3.5 of the Guidelines, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 13, 2025. In accordance with paragraph 8.3.6 of the Guidelines, the due date for Response was December 3, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 3, 2025. The Complainant filed a supplemental submission on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on December 16, 2025. 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 paragraph 8.5 of the Guidelines.


On December 23, 2025, the Panel issued his Procedural Order No.1, whereby he provided an opportunity to the Respondent to submit comments on the Complainant's supplemental submission dated December 8, 2025, by December 30, 2025. The Respondent submitted its comments on December 29, 2025.


4. Factual Background


The Complainant is an automotive manufacturer of luxury performance vehicles and sports utility vehicles, headquartered in England. It first introduced its Land Rover four-wheel drive vehicles in the 1940s, and uses the Land Rover brand in relation to its luxury vehicles and lifestyle products and services. The Complainant operates its official websites for the Land Rover brand at the domain names <landrover.co.uk> and <landrover.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for LAND ROVER in various jurisdictions (the "LAND ROVER trademark"), including the following representative registrations in Tanzania:

– the Tanzanian trademark LAND ROVER with registration No. 21912, registered on January 23, 1992 for goods in International Class 12, including for, inter alia, motor vehicles;

– the Tanzanian trademark  with registration No. 23478, registered on June 22, 1995, for goods in International Class 12, including for, inter alia, motor vehicles;

– the Tanzanian trademark  with registration No. TZS2013675, registered on August 15, 2014 for goods in International Class 41, including for, inter alia, entertainment services; sporting and cultural activities, automotive fan club services, organizing, arranging and conducting motor vehicle riding events for entertainment and recreational purposes; and

– the Tanzanian trademark  with registration No. TZS2013676, registered on June 5, 2017 for services in International Class 39, including for, inter alia, arrangement of driving experience days and driving holidays, arrangement of off-road adventure expeditions, arrangement of self-drive tours.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 26, 2024. It is currently blocked by Internet browsers, which display a warning that the connection is not private.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, at the time of its filing the disputed domain name resolved to a website with the tab title "Land Rover Tanzania Festival 2025" that prominently displayed the logo



The website offered to visitors to register for participation in the Land Rover Festival Tanzania 2025, which was organized on November 28-30, 2025 in Iringa, Tanzania. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the website offered paid registration for adults and for vehicles. The festival was described as including off-road adventures, immersion in authentic Tanzanian culture, competitions and photography workshops. The Frequently Asked Questions section of the website included the question "Are accommodation and meals included?" and the answer "The festival offers various accommodation packages from camping to luxury lodges. Meals during official are included, with options for dietary restrictions". The website also stated that the festival was supported by the Tanzania Tourism Board, the Tanzania Ministry of Natural Resources and by the official Tanzania Land Rover Club.

The Respondent submits that its name is Wasanda Magubu, and describes itself as a Tanzanian organizer of community off-road recreational activities.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its LAND ROVER trademark, because it incorporates the trademark in its entirety, while the additional element "festival" can be perceived as a descriptor of the services offered by the Respondent, namely an event featuring the Complainant's vehicles. The Complainant submits that it has built up a significant reputation in its LAND ROVER trademark through its substantial use in the course of trade over the last six decades, and the trademark enjoys a high degree of consumer recognition. The Complainant adds that the Top-Level Domain (.co.tz) can be disregarded for the purposes of the comparison under the Guidelines.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any relevant trademark rights in "LAND ROVER", and the Complainant has not authorized it to use the LAND ROVER trademark. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, but attempts to mislead consumers into thinking that the services offered on the website at the disputed domain name originate from the Complainant. The Complainant states that the website at the disputed domain name is commercial, as it offers participation in an event hosting competitions and vendor involvement, does not offer genuine services authorized by the Complainant, claims to have an affiliation with the Complainant's "official club"; and is designed around the Complainant's LAND ROVER trademark and suggests an official event similar to the off-road driving experience events offered by the Complainant. According to the Complainant, all this shows that the Respondent's selection and use of the disputed domain name was intended to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant's LAND ROVER trademark from the advertising and other commercial opportunities which result from creating an association with it. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent's conduct represents a commercial exploitation of the LAND ROVER trademark.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It submits that at the date on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the LAND ROVER trademark was already well-known and very familiar to a large number of consumers around the world, and that its presence and reputation in East Africa, including Tanzania, is longstanding. The Complainant maintains that the Respondent was therefore well aware of the LAND ROVER trademark when registering the disputed domain name, and its registration must have been made with the aim to establish an unauthorized association with the Complainant's brand for commercial gain. According to the Complainant, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract Internet users to the website at the disputed domain name to sign up for its festival for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the festival by the Complainant.

With its supplemental submission, the Complainant makes the following statements:

The Complainant disputes the Respondent claims that the use of the disputed domain name is non-commercial, and submits a screenshot from the website at the disputed domain name that shows a pricing summary to demonstrate that the Respondent's activities are in fact commercial.

The Complainant also attaches correspondence from welfare and conservation organizations, which according to it shows confusion and harm to the LAND ROVER brand.

B. Respondent

The Respondent states that it is a Tanzanian organizer of community off-road recreational activities, and adds that it is a club member working for and on behalf of the Land Rover Club Tanzania which is also a host of the Land Rover Festival Tanzania.

According to the Respondent, the “Festival Tanzania” is the name given by community members to an informal annual gathering of owners of older Land Rover-type vehicles commonly used in East Africa, which event is cultural and enthusiast-driven, and is similar to other events such as “Toyota Fans Day”, “Vintage Car Meet-Up”, etc. The Respondent maintains that the disputed domain name was registered only to create a simple information page, containing the dates, venues and registration for attendance. The Respondent states that Land Rover Festival is not a commercial activity, but a gathering of enthusiast Land Rover owners and users to network, bond, have fun and share experience. According to the Respondent, to deny the Land Rover owners’ right to gather and have fun is a denial of their right to use their cars.

The Respondent states that it has never sold any goods, misrepresented itself as the Complainant, or received any commercial benefit from the disputed domain name. The Respondent adds that it does not manufacture any goods manufactured by the Complainant and the activities of its club cannot impair the reputation of the Complainant’s brand, as it only makes a bona fide invitation to owners and fans to join and have fun, which cannot harm the reputation of the Complainant.

The Respondent maintains that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and that it is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers and to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark.

The Respondent adds that the Land Rover Festival does not sell spare parts, vehicles, accessories or other products and does not operate an online store, marketplace or dealership. It adds that the festival is free from advertising, sponsorship contracts, product sales, or profit.

The Respondent notes that vehicle owners commonly organize events around well-known brands (e.g., Jeep Jamborees, VW Beetle rallies, Land Cruiser Allies) without implying corporate sponsorship.

The Respondent makes the following statements in its comments on the Complainant’s supplemental submission:

The Respondent submits that the references to fees or pricing on its website relate solely to the collective organization and pooling of shared costs associated with participation in scheduled festival activities, which costs include third-party fees/charges, such as camping or accommodation charges imposed by venue operators, logistical coordination costs, and voluntary contributions toward community and conservation charity activities conducted during the festival. The Respondent explains that such amounts would otherwise be paid individually by participants directly to third parties, and it collects them solely for administrative convenience and transparency, without retaining any surplus or profit. According to the Respondent, the recovery or pooling of costs, absent a profit motive, does not constitute commercial use and may support a finding of legitimate noncommercial or fair use, consistent with section 2.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Respondent also states that the third-party correspondence submitted by the Complainant does not demonstrate actual consumer confusion in the relevant marketplace or misrepresentation by the Respondent. It notes that Panels have consistently held that speculative or incidental confusion is insufficient to establish bad faith, particularly where the domain name is used descriptively.

Finally, the Respondent submits that to the extent that any misunderstanding may have arisen, it is willing to clarify its independent status through clear disclaimers.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 5.1 of the Guidelines, in order to succeed, the Complainant must prove that:

6.1.1. the Respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

6.1.2. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

6.1.3. the Respondent's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant must prove that each of these three elements is present.

The Panel notes that the Guidelines are substantively similar to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy. In reaching his decision on the present dispute, the Panel has therefore taken into account, to the extent appropriate, certain previous decisions and established practices under the UDRP, including as summarized in the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

6.1. Procedural issue – Court proceedings in Tanzania

The Respondent submits that the Complainant has initiated legal proceedings before the courts of Tanzania in commercial case No. 29557 of 2025, by filing a petition concerning the Land Rover Festival, including matters directly related to the disputed domain name. According to the Respondent, these proceedings are currently at the hearing stage, and the issues raised there substantially overlap with the allegations and relief sought in the Complaint. The Respondent argues that the Tanzanian courts are the proper forum for resolving the broader factual and legal issues raised by the Complainant.

The Respondent has however not provided any evidence about the alleged court proceedings in Tanzania, the parties involved, and their subject-matter and relief sought, and has not explained how the present proceeding and its outcome may be affected by such proceedings. Basically, the Respondent has not put the Panel in a position to assess the relevance of the alleged court proceedings in Tanzania.

Paragraph 8.16.1 of the Guidelines gives the panel discretion to suspend, terminate, or continue a proceeding under the Guidelines in the event of any legal proceedings initiated prior to or during an administrative proceeding in respect of a domain-name dispute that is the subject of the complaint.

The above provision is almost identical to Paragraph 18(a) of the UDRP Rules, discussed in section 4.14 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). As discussed in that section, appointed panels are reluctant to suspend a UDRP case due to concurrent court proceedings, most notably because of the potential for indeterminate delay, and generally issue a UDRP decision on the merits even in an overlapping court-UDRP proceeding scenario where, notwithstanding the fact that a UDRP decision would not be binding on the court, the relative expediency of the UDRP versus courts is seen as a benefit to the parties. Panel reluctance to terminate a UDRP case on this basis often also takes account of, and respects, the potential for a court action to address causes of action separate from that being addressed in the UDRP proceeding. Where there is a prior or pending court proceeding, it is within the panel's discretion to determine the relevance of such proceeding in the UDRP context, in light of the case circumstances.

The Panel regards the above summary of the practice under the UDRP as relevant and appropriate to be applied in the present proceeding, and notes that under paragraph 8.8.3 of the Guidelines, the Panel shall ensure that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Considering the above, and in exercise of his powers under paragraphs 8.8.1 and 8.16.1 of the Guidelines, the Panel decides to proceed with the issuance of the present decision.

6.2. Procedural issue – Supplemental submissions of the Parties

Both Parties in this proceeding have submitted supplemental submissions.

Having reviewed them together with the Complaint and the Response, the Panel finds that the supplemental submissions of the Parties address issues that they could not have contemplated and addressed in the Complaint and in the Response, which makes them relevant and justifies their acceptance in the proceeding.

Therefore, the Panel decides to accept and take into account the Parties' supplemental submissions.

Substantive issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

There are two elements of paragraph 5.1.1 of the Guidelines which the Complainant must prove to succeed in this dispute.

The first is that the Complainant has rights in a trademark or service mark. The Complainant has such rights in the LAND ROVER trademark in various jurisdictions, including in Tanzania, being the country that corresponds to the ".tz" country code Top-Level-Domain ("ccTLD") and the country where the Respondent operates.

The second is that the Complainant must show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark in which it has rights. For the purpose of comparison, it is well-established that the ccTLD, in this case ".co.tz", is not relevant as it is a necessary component of the disputed domain name. If that suffix is disregarded, only the section "landroverfestival" remains. This section incorporates the easily-recognizable LAND ROVER trademark in combination with the dictionary word "festival". As discussed in section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LAND ROVER trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and that the elements of paragraph 5.1.1 of the Guidelines have been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 5.1.2 of the Guidelines, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent claims that "Festival Tanzania" is an informal enthusiast-driven annual gathering of owners of Land Rover vehicles, and maintains that the pricing on its website relates only to the collective organization and pooling of shared costs associated with participation in the festival activities, which include third-party fees/charges, such as camping or accommodation charges imposed by venue operators, logistical coordination costs, and voluntary contributions toward community and charity activities. The Respondent states that such amounts would otherwise be paid individually by participants directly to third parties, and it collects them solely for administrative convenience and transparency, without retaining any surplus or profit.

The Respondent's website however indicates no organizing committee or person responsible for the organization of the festival, and contains no list of members. The Respondent claims that transparency is one of its main goals, but there is no transparency on its website about the types and amounts of the various costs and expenses for the organization of the festival, no calculation of the amounts that each participant in the festival has to pay to cover these costs and expenses, and no indication of the person or entity that handles these financial matters. Notably, the website states that the festival itself offers various accommodation packages and meals, rather than referring to third party offerings. The website also claims that the festival has official support from the Government of Tanzania and a partnership with the official Land Rover Club Tanzania, but the Respondent has not provided any documents in support of this allegation and has not indicated the person or entity who is in contact with these institutions. The Complainant denies that it or the official Land Rover Club Tanzania has authorized or supported the event.

Considering all the above, it appears to the Panel as more likely than not that the festival is not an informal not-for-profit gathering of enthusiasts, as claimed by the Respondent, but rather a commercial operation carried out for profit using the LAND ROVER brand. There is no authorization and support of the event by the Complainant, but visitors of the Respondent's website may well be misled to believe otherwise. It is also worth mentioning here that the festival organization and related services advertised on the Respondent's website appear to be within the scope of protection of the LAND ROVER trademark registered by the Complainant in Tanzania. The Respondent's conduct therefore does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

On this basis, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and the Complainant has established the requirement under paragraph 5.1.2 of the Guidelines.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The final element which the Complainant must demonstrate is listed in paragraph 5.1.3 of the Guidelines, under which the Complainant must prove that the Respondent's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith. Paragraph 5.2 of the Guidelines sets out a non-exclusive list of the types of circumstances that "shall be evidence of the registration or use of a domain name in bad faith".

Here, the Respondent has registered a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's popular LAND ROVER trademark. The content of the associated website makes it clear that the Respondent was well aware of this trademark when registering the disputed domain name, and that it has chosen it with an intention to invoke an association with this trademark and with the Complainant. The Respondent has used it in connection with a website advertising a three-day festival of Land Rover vehicles without including a disclaimer for the absence of a relationship with the Complainant, but rather with a misleading statement that the festival is supported by the official Land Rover Club Tanzania. As discussed in the previous section, this festival appears to be a commercial operation rather than a not-for-profit enthusiast event, and its organization and carrying out appears to fall within the scope of protection of the Complainant's LAND ROVER trademark.

All the above supports a conclusion that by registering and using the disputed domain name, 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 LAND ROVER trademark as to the affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website and of the event organization services offered on its website. This supports a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name under Paragraph 5.2.4 of the Guidelines.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent's domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

7. Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 5.8.2 of the Guidelines, the Panel orders that the domain name <landroverfestival.co.tz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: January 6, 2026