Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108257

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108257
Time of filing	2025-12-17 10:57:32
Domain names	worldiatravelprogram.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	WORLDIA GROUP

Complainant representative

Organization	MATTHIEU BERGUIG AVOCAT

Respondent

Name	Dewitt Howe

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

Worldia Group operates as a travel agency under the business name "WORLDIA". Worldia Group is also the owner of several "WORLDIA" trademarks, including:

- a European Union trademark #017931108 filed on 17 July 2018 that aims traveling services (classes 39 and 43);
- a World Trademark #1483381 filed on 24 June 2019 that aims at traveling services (classes 39 and 43).

Worldia Group is also the owner of several domain names, such as "worldia.com" and "worldia.fr", which are being used as URLs for Worldia's website (respectively international and French websites).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Worldia Group, operates a travel agency under the business name “WORLDIA” and offers travel-related services, including customized travel planning and travel programs.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark rights in WORLDIA, including:

- European Union Trademark No. 017931108, filed 17 July 2018, covering travel-related services in classes 39 and 43; and
- International Trademark (Madrid) No. 1483381, filed 24 June 2019, covering travel-related services in classes 39 and 43.

The Complainant also owns and uses domain names including <worldia.com> and <worldia.fr> for its international and French websites.

The disputed domain name was used for a website that, according to the Complainant, was designed in a manner likely to cause confusion with the Complainant, including by referencing the Complainant's distinctive assets (graphical and textual elements). The Complainant submitted evidence that, in the view of the Complainant, indicates that internet users/customers were confused by the disputed domain name and website. The website appears to be inactive/offline, though the disputed domain name remains registered. The Complainant further points to prior decisions involving the Complainant's WORLDIA rights relating to similar domain names, which resulted in transfer to the Complainant.

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

1. 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

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

1. id trademark registrations and evidence dating back to 2018.

   The Panel therefore turns to the assessment of whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

   1. The disputed domain name consists of two principal elements. First, it fully reproduces the Complainant's trademark "WORLDIA".

   Second, the disputed domain name contains the term "travelprogram", which is not separated by a hyphen. This term is purely descriptive and directly refers to the Complainant's business activity in the travel sector, namely the organization and sale of travel programs.

Rather than dispelling confusion, the addition of this descriptive term reinforces the association with the Complainant and increases the likelihood that Internet users will assume that the disputed domain name is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the addition of the term “travelprogram” is immaterial and insufficient to avoid confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s trademark.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy under paragraph 4(a)(i).

2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Based on the evidence in the record and in light of the Respondent’s failure to submit any response or supporting evidence, the Panel proceeds on the basis of the uncontested facts.

Although the Complaint is concise, the unrebutted evidence clearly demonstrates that:

a) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;
b) the Respondent has no corporate, contractual, or other relationship with the Complainant;
c) the Respondent has not been authorized to use the Complainant’s trademark or to conduct any business on the Complainant’s behalf.

The Panel notes that the Complainant has thereby established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. As set out in section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the burden of production then shifts to the Respondent. In the absence of any response, the Respondent has failed to rebut this prima facie case.

On the balance of probabilities, the above factual circumstances, combined with the use of the descriptive term “travelprogram” in the disputed domain name, indicate a clear intention to create an implied association with the Complainant and to present the disputed domain name as an official or authorized channel of the Complainant.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Consequently, the Complainant has satisfied the second requirement of the Policy under paragraph 4(a)(ii).

3. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

On the basis of the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and of its WORLDIA trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the Complainant’s trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the deliberate inclusion of the term “travelprogram” — which directly corresponds to the Complainant’s core business — strongly suggests that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant’s rights and intentionally targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

The structure and content of the disputed domain name indicate an attempt to present it as an official or affiliated platform of the Complainant, without any disclaimer or legitimate explanation of such an association. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, this conduct constitutes a misrepresentation of an affiliation with the Complainant.

The Panel therefore finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent intentionally sought to exploit the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website and/or the disputed domain name, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and as summarized in section 3.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **worldiatravelprogram.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jan Schnedler**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-13

Publish the Decision