Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108271

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108271
Time of filing	2025-12-22 18:15:56
Domain names	starstablegame.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Star Stable Entertainment AB

Complainant representative

Organization	SILKA AB

Respondent

Name	li bin

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 claims to be the owner of numerous trademarks KRUPP in various jurisdictions worldwide, including but not limited to the followings:

- International Trademark Registration number 1771011 STAR STABLE (device mark), registered on 24 April 2023, in international classes 9, 16, 25 and 41;
- China Trademark Registration number 16108464 STAR STABLE (word mark), registered on 14 March 2016, in international class 41;
- China Trademark Registration number 16108465 STAR STABLE (word mark), registered on 14 March 2016, in international class 9;
- United States Trademark Registration number 3814190 STAR STABLE (word mark), registered on 6 July 2010, in international class 9;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration number UK00908696775 STAR STABLE (word mark), registered on 5 April 2010, in international class 9;
- European Union Trademark Registration number 008696775 STAR STABLE (word mark), registered on 5 April 2010, in international class 9.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Swedish game studio headquartered in Sodermalm, Stockholm. It is known for developing Star Stable Online, a multiplayer online game with more than 25 million registered users as of 2023, as well as the Star Stable Horses app. Founded in 2010 by Ola Ahlvarsson and Johan Edfeldt, the Complainant has grown into a diverse organization with approximately 130 employees representing more than 30 nationalities. In 2020, the Complainant reported revenues of USD 44 million, reflecting its strong position in the gaming industry and its continued success in delivering story-driven experiences to a global audience.

The Complainant maintains an online presence through several channels. These include the website at the domain name <starstable.com>, registered on 16 October 2007, which provides information about and access to Star Stable Online. The Complainant also operates official social media accounts, including an Instagram account with over 684,000 followers and a Facebook account with more than 272,000 followers.

The Respondent appears to be an individual based in Guangdong, China.

The disputed domain name was registered on 1 August 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).

The Complainant claims rights in the STAR STABLE mark through its trademark registrations. By virtue of its trademark registrations, the Complainant has proved that it has rights in the mark under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See Avast Software s. r. o. v Milen Radumilo, 102384, (CAC 2019-03-12).

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name fully reproduces the Complainant’s STAR STABLE mark, which is protected by numerous trademark registrations predating the disputed domain name’s registration on 31 July 2025. Given this complete reproduction, the STAR STABLE mark is clearly recognizable in the domain name and, therefore, the domain name would normally be considered confusingly similar to the STAR STABLE mark for purposes of the first element under the Policy. The disputed domain name also incorporates the term “game” alongside the STAR STABLE mark, a term closely associated with the Complainant’s business, given that its flagship product is the MMORPG Star Stable Online. Such an addition does not in any way diminish the identity or confusing similarity between the domain name and the STAR STABLE mark for purposes of the first element under the Policy.

By doing a side-by-side comparison, the Panel agrees that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, see paragraph 1.7 of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied 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). More specifically, the Complainant must first make a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the burden of proof then shifts to the Respondent to show it does have rights or legitimate interests. See PepsiCo, Inc. v Smith power production, 102378, (CAC 2019-03-08) ("The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that arises from the considerations above. All of these matters go to make out the prima facie case against the Respondent. As the Respondent has not filed a Response or attempted by any other means to rebut the prima facie case against it, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.").

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any consent, permission, authorization, or acquiescence from the Complainant to use its STAR STABLE mark in connection with the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has found no indication that the Respondent owns any trademark identical to the disputed

domain name or to the terms “starstablegame,” “starstable game,” or “star stable game”. There is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the terms “starstablegame,” “starstable game,” or “star stable game”. The Respondent has neither used nor made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use, as the domain name does not resolve to an active website. Furthermore, the Complainant has found no evidence of any use since the disputed domain name’s registration on 31 July 2025.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. As a result, the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate such rights or interests. However, the Respondent has failed to submit any response within the required timeframe to rebut these assertions.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied 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).

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name reproduces the STAR STABLE trademark in its entirety, together with the term “game”, directly relating to the Complainant’s flagship product, Star Stable Online. It was registered on 31 July 2025, long after the Complainant had secured international trademark rights in STAR STABLE, showing that the Respondent acted with knowledge of the Complainant’s mark. A simple trademark or Google search at the time of registration would have revealed the Complainant’s rights, and given the mark’s prominence online, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of it.

Moreover, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and has not been used since registration. The disputed domain name has also been configured with MX records, creating a risk of phishing or impersonation by misleading Internet users familiar with the Complainant. The Respondent’s prior involvement in UDRP cases further underscores a pattern of abusive conduct. Taken together, these facts establish bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

Having considered the circumstances and noting the Respondent’s failure to submit a response, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no plausible justification for registering the disputed domain name, particularly given the Complainant’s well-established Star Stable trademark, which was first registered 15 years prior. The Panel also finds that passive holding of a domain name does not preclude such a finding, see Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG v. wang lao, 108164 (CAC 2025-12-17) and 3.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.0.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied 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.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS - LANGUAGE OF PROCEEDING:

The Panel notes that the language of the Registration Agreements is Chinese, as confirmed by the Registrar. The official Complaint was submitted in English and the Respondents did not submit an official response. Pursuant to paragraph 11 of the Rules, unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, or specified otherwise in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement. However, this is subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.

The Complainant requests that English be used as the language of the proceeding, arguing that the disputed domain name uses Latin characters and the English word “game” with the STAR STABLE mark, showing familiarity with English. The Complainant is a Swedish company represented by Swedish counsel; neither party understands Chinese, but both are fluent in English, which is commonly used in international proceedings. Requiring Chinese would force the Complainant to incur disproportionate translation costs. The disputed domain name fully incorporates the well-known STAR STABLE trademark with a term closely related to the Complainant’s business.

The Panel observes that, although the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, it is composed of Latin characters. There is no evidence to suggest that using English as the language of the proceeding would be unfair to the Respondent. See Jo Malone Inc. v. Li Bin, FA2412002132959 (FORUM February 6, 2025).

The Panel is bilingual and fully capable of conducting the proceeding in both Chinese and English. Having considered the circumstances and noting the Respondent’s failure to submit a response, the Panel concludes that the use of English as the language of the proceeding would be fair to both parties and would serve the UDRP’s objective of facilitating the swift resolution of disputes. Accordingly, the Panel determines that the language requirement has been satisfied, and that the language of the

proceeding shall be English.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Having established all three elements required under the Policy, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name should be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **starstablegame.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mr Paddy TAM**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-19

Publish the Decision