

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mozilla Foundation and Mozilla Corporation v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. DWS2026-0002

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Mozilla Foundation and Mozilla Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

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

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mozilla.ws> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 27, 2026. On May 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 28, 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 (Redacted For Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on June 1, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on June 4, 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 June 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Leo (Yi) Liu as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 first Complainant, Mozilla Foundation, is a non-profit organization based in California. The second Complainant, Mozilla Corporation, is the first Complainant's wholly owned subsidiary (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Complainant"). The Complainant provides, amongst others, Internet-related open-source software including the well-known FIREFOX web browser. The Complainant has, since 2002, used the MOZILLA mark extensively in connection with its Mozilla projects, and has acquired considerable goodwill and notoriety worldwide.

The Complainant owns several trademarks for MOZILLA in numerous jurisdictions, including:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 182899 for MOZILLA in International Classes 9, 38, and 42, registered on March 3, 1999;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 2815227 for MOZILLA in International Class 9, registered on February 17, 2004; and
- International Registration No. 974622 for MOZILLA in International Class 9, registered on August 13, 2008.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <mozilla.ca>, <mozilla.org>, <mozilla.com>, <mozilla.net>, <mozilla.ch>, and <mozilla.hk>.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on April 27, 2026. Until April 28, 2026, it resolved to a website titled "Welcome to Mozilla Chain, the first decentralized data and AI sovereignty network, built by Mozilla", which purported to offer a data and AI platform while prominently displaying the Complainant's MOZILLA mark and logo. The Complainant asserts that the website at the disputed domain name adopted a similar look and feel to the Complainant's website, and did not include any disclaimer as to the lack of relationship with the Complainant. Following abuse reports to the Registrar and the DNS Host, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

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 identical to the Complainant's MOZILLA trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and therefore has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To obtain the relief it has requested, the Complainant must prove the presence of each of the three elements of the Policy: 1) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; 2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and 3) the disputed domain name has been registered and 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the record submitted, 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 MOZILLA mark is reproduced within 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 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.

As shown by the record, the Complainant's trademark is identically reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence that it has engaged in any use of or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The prior use of the disputed domain name for a website impersonating the Complainant, including use of the MOZILLA mark and logo without a disclaimer, cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

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.

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 while the disputed domain name is currently inactive, the disputed domain name was registered many years after the registration of the Complainant's MOZILLA trademarks. Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the MOZILLA mark, the identity between the disputed domain name and the mark, the Respondent's lack of participation in the proceedings, and the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name for a website that impersonated the Complainant and displayed the MOZILLA mark and logo without any disclaimer, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of, and intent to target, the Complainant and its mark.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy: by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's MOZILLA mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Further, for the reasons outlined in the preceding paragraph, the fact that the disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website, following the Complainant's abuse reports, does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

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 <mozilla.ws> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Leo (Yi) Liu/

Leo (Yi) Liu

Sole Panelist

Date: July 29, 2026