

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dream Sports Inc. and Sporta Technologies Private Limited v.
Dream Team 11
Case No. D2022-3635

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Dream Sports Inc., United States of America (“United States”), and Sporta Technologies Private Limited, India, represented by Fidus Law Chambers, India.

The Respondent is Dream Team 11, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dream11.store> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 30, 2022. On September 30, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 30, 2022, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on October 7, 2022, 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 October 8, 2022.

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 October 18, 2022. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 7, 2022. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 14, 2022.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on November 18, 2022. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainants or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules, and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainants are Dream Sports Inc. and its subsidiary Sporta Technologies Private Limited, a United States company and an Indian company respectively, operating in the field of online fantasy sport leagues and owning several trademark registrations for DREAM11, among which the following:

- Indian Trademark Registration No. 3660851 for DREAM11 and design, registered on October 22, 2017;
- Indian Trademark Registration No. 4863621 for DREAM11, registered on September 25, 2019.

The Complainants also operate on the Internet, with the domain names <dream11.com> and <dream11.in>, registered on March 17, 2008, and June 26, 2008, respectively.

The Complainants provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on March 10, 2022, and it resolves to an inactive webpage.

5. Further Procedural questions

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, panels are required to ensure that the parties are treated with equality and that each party is given a fair opportunity to present its case and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Noting that Respondent's disclosed location appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should. The Panel has reached this conclusion in part due to Respondent's apparent awareness of the proceeding and control over the disputed domain name. Further to the Rules, the Center transmitted the Written Notice of the Complaint to both the named Privacy Service and Respondent. The Center also sent the Notification of Complaint by email to Respondent at its email address as registered with the Registrar and to a postmaster email address as specified by the Rules. There is no evidence that the case notification email to the disclosed Respondent

email address was not successfully delivered.

It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no serious doubt (albeit in the absence of any Response) that Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel also notes that the Complainant has specified in the Complaint that any challenge made by the Respondent to any decision to transfer or cancel the disputed domain name shall be referred to the jurisdiction of the Courts of the location of the principal office of the concerned registrar. In this case, the principal office of the Registrar, Namecheap, Inc., is in Arizona, United States of America.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and decides that the administrative proceeding should continue (for a similar procedural decision, see *Netbet Entreprises Ltd v. Privacy Service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Vladimir Vladimir, Crowd inc*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1420](#)).

6. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants state that the disputed domain name is identical to their trademark DREAM11, as the disputed domain name wholly contains the Complainants' trademark.

Moreover, the Complainants assert that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainants to register the disputed domain name or to use their trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and it is not making either a *bona fide* offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainants submit that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainants' trademark DREAM11 is distinctive and internationally known in the field of online fantasy sport leagues. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainants' trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainants contend that the passive holding of the disputed domain name qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainants' contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn (see, e.g., *Reuters Limited v. Global Net 2000, Inc*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0441](#); *Microsoft Corporation v. Freak Films Oy*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0109](#); *SSL International PLC v. Mark Freeman*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1080](#); *Altavista Company v. Grandtotal Finances Limited et. al.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0848](#); *Confédération Nationale du Crédit Mutuel, Caisse Fédérale du Crédit Mutuel Nord Europe v. Marketing Total S.A.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0288](#)).

7. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have 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.

A. Consolidation of Multiple Complainants

The Complaint and the amended Complaint were filed by two Complainants, and the Complainants have requested consolidation of multiple complainants. No objection to this request was made by the Respondent.

Pursuant to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.11.1: “assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation”.

The Panel finds that there is sufficient evidence that the Complainants have common grievance against the Respondent, who has engaged in a common conduct that has affected both of them, and that the consolidation would be procedurally efficient and equitable. The Panel further notes that the Respondent did not object to the consolidation request. The Panel therefore accepts the Complainants’ consolidation request.

For the purpose of this decision, the “Complainant” will refer to both the Complainants.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant is the owner of the trademark DREAM11 both by registration and acquired reputation and that the disputed domain name is identical to the trademark DREAM11.

It is well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), in this case “.store”, is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore met its burden of proving that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark, pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation:

“(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the three elements of the Policy. However, satisfying the burden of proving a lack of the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is potentially quite difficult, since proving a negative circumstance is generally more complicated than establishing a positive one. As such, it is well accepted that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of production to the Respondent. If the Respondent fails to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or on any other basis, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent, who is not currently associated with the Complainant in any way, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making a *bona fide* offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The *prima facie* case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that he has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name, and the Panel is unable to establish any such rights or legitimate interests on the basis of the evidence in front of it. While the Registrar confirmed that the underlying registrant was “Dream Team 11”, the Respondent has provided no evidence that it was commonly known by “Dream 11” or “Dream Team 11”.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that “[f]or the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that [the respondent has] registered or [has] acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [its] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [the respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion

with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] web site or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location".

Regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark DREAM11 is clearly established and the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant and its trademark and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As regards the use in bad faith of the disputed domain name, which resolves to an inactive webpage, the Panel considers that bad faith may exist even in cases of so-called "passive holding", as found in the landmark UDRP decision *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#). In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. See, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Finally, the Panel considers that the nature of the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's trademark, further supports a finding of bad faith. See, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has presented evidence to satisfy its burden of proof with respect to the issue of whether the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

8. 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 <dream11.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: November 28, 2022