Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108183

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108183
Time of filing	2025-11-27 11:14:26
Domain names	skokka.lol

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Strasshill Holding Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	Notarbartolo & Gervasi S.p.A:

Respondent

Organization	Domains By Proxy, LLC

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

According to the submitted evidence, the Complainant owns, among many others, the following Trademarks:

- European Union trademark for SKOKKA (word mark), Registration No. 012610374, registered on July 16, 2014, in force until February 18, 2034, in International Classes ("ICs") 35, 38, 42, 45;

-European Union trademark for SKOKKA (and design), Registration No. 012827771, registered on September 9, 2014, in force until April 28, 2034, in ICs 35, 38, 42, 45;

-United Kingdom trademark for SKOKKA (and design), Registration No. UK00003760552, registered on June 3, 2022, in force until March 1, 2032, in ICs 35, 38, 42;

-International trademark for SKOKKA (and design), Registration No. 1699647, registered on May 23, 2022, in force until May 23, 2032, in ICs classes 38, 42, and designating Brazil, Colombia, European Union, India, and Mexico.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Based in Cyprus, the Complainant is a comprehensive technology company that manages the entire product lifecycle for mobile and

desktop platforms. The Complainant's expertise spans from initial conceptualization and UX/UI design to quality testing and final materialization.

The Complainant also provides full-stack technical support, overseeing the hardware, middleware, and network administration for their digital infrastructure.

The Complainant registered and has operated <skokka.com>, an adult dating website, since its inception in October 2012. The website publishes listings for adult dating services, divided by country and city worldwide.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the website <skokka.com> has become "The Adult Dating Reference", with 99.52 million visits between January and March 2025.

The disputed domain name <skokka.lol> was registered on November 29, 2024, and according to the evidence submitted, it redirects users to <pl.escort.club>, a Polish-language website operating in the adult dating and escort services sector.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

Complainant Contentions:

- The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark SKOKKA; that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".lol" is irrelevant for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity; that the term ".lol", commonly associated with online entertainment or humorous content, may reinforce the misleading association with the Complainant's adult-oriented digital platform.

- The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or any legitimate interest over the disputed domain name, given that the Respondent has redirected the domain name to a third-party active commercial website, for adult escort and dating services, in direct competition to the Complainant, which doesn't constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by "skokka.lol", nor does the Respondent hold any trademark rights; that the Respondent is neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way; that the Complainant has not granted any license, permission, or consent—express or implied—for the registration or use of a domain name incorporating the SKOKKA trademark; that the disputed domain name's redirection constitutes a clear intend to mislead users into believing that the destination website is owned, operated, or endorsed by the Complainant, and such use is inherently deceptive.

- The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In summary, concerning the bad faith registration, the disputed domain name's composition and further use constitute a clear indication of knowledge over the Complainant's line of business and trademark value at the time of its registration. Concerning the bad faith use, in this case, the redirection of the disputed domain name to a commercial website as <pl.escort.club> for adult escort and dating services, constitutes opportunistic bad faith, as recognized under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Additionally, that the Respondent has made use of a privacy/proxy service to mask its identity, which in this case may strengthen the inference of bad faith, citing the WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.6.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met, and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the onus is on the Complainant to prove:

(i) the disputed domain name 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 disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn.

Identical or Confusingly Similar

Concerning the First Element of the Policy, the Complainant has sufficiently proved before the Panel that owns trademark Rights over the term SKOKKA. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.2.1.

In this case, the entirety of the Complainant's trademark SKOKKA is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7. and 1.10.

Concerning section 1.10 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, states that:

> "Panel assessment of identity or confusing similarity involves comparing the (alpha-numeric) domain name and the **textual components** of the relevant mark. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be **incapable of representation** in domain names, these elements are largely **disregarded** for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element (…)." (emphasis added).

In relation to the generic Top-Level Domain ".lol", it may be disregarded. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

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

Rights or Legitimate Interests

Concerning the Second Element of the Policy, to this Panel it is clear that:

(1) The Respondent is not associated with or affiliated with or hasn't been authorized or licensed by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name.

(2) There is no favourable evidence towards the Respondent concerning the composition and further use of the disputed domain name, by reproducing exactly the Complainant's trademark SKOKKA, to redirect users to a competing site (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.3).

(3) There is no evidence that the Respondent corresponds or has become commonly known by the term "skokka.lol".

(4) Nothing in the record suggests or infers any fair or non-commercial use of the disputed domain name, in particular given the nature of the redirection (see paragraph 4.c.(iii) of the Policy).

According to the evidence submitted before this Panel, where the Respondent did not submit any response or communication during the entire proceeding, the Complainant has made out its prima facie case.

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

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Registration in Bad Faith:

In this case, according to the evidence provided, by the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the Complainant had already established its trademark Rights over the distinctive term SKOKKA, at least since July 2014.

Regarding whether SKOKKA is perceived as a well-known trademark in its sector, this Panel finds that, in this case, the assertion lacks sufficient evidence (see Aero Club v. Domain Admin - DomainGrabber.com, WIPO Case No. D2013-1656).

To this Panel, given the composition, gTLD category (i.e., ".lol"), and further use of the disputed domain name, it's clear that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's line of business activity and trademark value, by the time of its registration, and did it with the Complainant's value in mind. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.2.

Use in Bad Faith:

As described in this Decision, the Respondent has registered a domain name that exactly reproduces the Complainant's trademark, SKOKKA, under the gTLD ".lol", to redirect it to <pl.escort.club> an active commercial website for adult escort and dating services, thereby creating confusion among Internet users, incurring in false affiliation with the Complainant, and of course, falling into paragraph 4.b.(iv) of the Policy.

In relation to it, the WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.4, states that:

> "(…) Panels have moreover found the following types of evidence to support a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark: (i) actual confusion, (ii) **seeking to cause confusion** (including by technical means beyond the domain name itself) for the respondent's commercial benefit, even if unsuccessful, (iii) **the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name**, (iv) redirecting the domain name to a different respondent-owned website, even where such website contains a disclaimer, (v) **redirecting the domain name to the complainant's (or a competitor's) website**, and (vi) absence of any conceivable good faith use.(…)" (emphasis added).

Additionally, the Respondent has concealed its identity by using a proxy, which, in this case, supports an inference of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.6.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **skokka.lol**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**María Alejandra López García**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-12

Publish the Decision