Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108281

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108281
Time of filing	2025-12-24 15:54:02
Domain names	sofiadates.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Astrasoft Projects Ltd

Respondent

Name	Erik Babich

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

The Complainant has evidenced to be the owner, inter alia, of the following trademark registration with protection for the United States of America where the Respondent apparently is located:

- Word mark SOFIA DATE, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), registration No.: 6856457, registration date: May 27, 2022, status: active.

Also, the Complainant has demonstrated to own since 2020 the domain name <sofiadate.com> through which the Complainant operates its dating platform at “www. sofiadate.com”.

The disputed domain name was created on August 8, 2025.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar 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

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

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

First, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <sofiadates.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SOFIA DATE trademark, as it incorporates the latter entirely, simply in a typo-squatted version by adding the letter "s" and, thus, constituting a plural form of the terms reflected in said trademark. Numerous UDRP panels have recognized that where a domain name incorporates a trademark in its entirety, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that trademark. Moreover, it has been held in many UDRP decisions and has meanwhile become a consensus view among UDRP panels that a domain name which consists of a common, obvious or intentional misspelling of the complainant's trademark (i.e. a typo-squatting) is still considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant trademark for purposes of the first element under the UDRP. Accordingly, the fact that the disputed domain name obviously includes a misspelling/typo-squatting of the Complainant's SOFIA DATE trademark is not at all inconsistent with the finding of confusing similarity, especially given the fact that the Complainant's SOFIA DATE trademark is entirely included in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Complainant has established the first element under the Policy as set forth by paragraph 4(a)(i).

Second, the Complainant contends, and the Respondent has not objected to these contentions, that the Respondent has neither made use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent commonly known under the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain.

The Respondent apparently has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's SOFIA DATE trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that the Respondent's name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name, and the Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the terms "sofia" and/or "date" on its own. Finally, the Complainant has demonstrated that, at some point before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.camvice.com" displaying pornographic content, likely for some commercial gain. Such use of the disputed domain name, which obviously aims at somehow profiting from the reputation connected to the Complainant's undisputedly reputed SOFIA DATE trademark, neither qualifies as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that, therefore, the Complainant has also satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) and, thus, the second element of the Policy.

Third, the Panel holds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

The facts of this case allow the conclusion that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights in the SOFIA DATE trademark when registering the disputed domain name and that the latter is directed thereto. The Complainant's SOFIA DATE is undisputedly reputed; also, the disputed domain name constitutes a typo squatted version thereof, adding the letter "s" and, thus, constituting a plural form of the terms "sofia" and "date" reflected in said trademark. In turn, the terms "sofia" and "dates" in the disputed domain name lack any direct or indirect connection to pornographic content as it has been put in place on the website to which the disputed domain name at some point in the past redirected. Such circumstances are clear enough indications for this Panel that – absent any other indication as to why the Respondent needed incorporate the Complainant's reputed SOFIA DATE trademark in the disputed domain names – the Respondent obviously aimed at either somehow taking unfair advantage of the SOFIA DATE trademark or even at tarnishing the latter by redirecting the disputed domain name to pornographic content likely for some commercial gain. In this context, UDRP panels have long held that both scenarios give rise to find for bad faith acting on the part of the Respondent

Therefore, the Complainant has also satisfied the third element under the Policy as set forth by paragraph 4(a)(iii).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **sofiadates.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Stephanie Hartung**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-12

Publish the Decision