Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108387

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108387
Time of filing	2026-02-10 07:50:58
Domain names	uefacoachinglicense.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Union des Associations Européennes de Football (UEFA)

Complainant representative

Organization	Stobbs IP

Respondent

Organization	NA NA

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 a large international portfolio of registered trade marks consisting of or including the word element being the mark UEFA in multiple jurisdictions covering a wide range of goods and services connected with sport, education, media and commercial activities.

In particular, including but not limited to:

1. EUTM No. 007464084, for the Word mark, UEFA, Registration date: 22 July 2009, Classes: 3, 5–12, 14–16, 18, 20–21, 24–34, 36, 38–41, 43–45;
2. UK TM No. UK00907464084, for the Word mark: UEFA, Registration date 22 July 2009 Classes: 3, 5–12, 14–16, 18, 20–21, 24–34, 36, 38–41, 43–45; and
3. UK TM No. UK00910433944, for the logo mark including the word element UEFA, Registration date 26 April 2012, in Classes: 14, 16, 21, 25, 28, 35, 38, 41;
4. Mark No. 1008334, for the word mark UEFA, Registration date 19 February 2009 designating 13 non-EU nations and with Classes: 3, 5–12, 14–16, 18, 20–21, 24–34, 36, 38–41, 43–45.

The Complainant relies on its use on social media and its online presence at <uefa.com>.

The Complainant also relies upon the fame and reputation of the UEFA mark worldwide as a result of its administration of European football competitions and coaching development activities. This gives, and the Complainant relies on, the goodwill arising through use in common law jurisdictions. Previous panels have recognized the rights of the Complainant, including but not limited to:

UEFA v. Alliance International Media. WIPO Case No. D2000-0153 [<uefachampionsleague.com>]

UEFA v. Agustín Diego Carrasco 23024861k. WIPO Case No. DES2016-0030 [<uefachampionsleague.es>]

UEFA v. Wei Wang, easy king. CAC Case No. 104875 [<uefa2017.com> and <2016uefa.com>]

UEFA v. Mr. Parmjit Chokar. WIPO Case No. D2001-0688 [<uefaeuro2004.com>]

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is Union des Associations Européennes de Football ("UEFA"), the governing body of European football founded in 1954 and headquartered in Switzerland.

The Complainant administers a structured system of coaching qualifications through the UEFA Coaching Convention. The UEFA Coaching licenses are issued through recognised national football associations and are widely regarded as the principal coaching qualifications in European football.

The disputed domain name was registered on 22 January 2025. The Respondent is identified only as NA NA of New Jersey NY. The disputed domain name resolved to a website offering what are described as "UEFA Coaching License" courses and related training programmes. The website represents that such courses are accredited by UEFA and recognised by UEFA and national football federations.

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

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, (the Policy) the Complainant must prove that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights; (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 Policy does not provide for a default decision and the Complainant must discharge its burden of proof on all limbs of the Policy.

Confusing similarity

The Complainant owns registered rights in its UEFA trademark as above. It is a famous mark or a mark with a reputation. The disputed domain name incorporates the UEFA mark in its entirety together with the descriptive terms “coaching” and “license”. The addition of such generic terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and in fact reinforces the association with the Complainant’s coaching activities. The generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is disregarded for the purposes of the first element but is engaged in the analysis for the other limbs below.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights.

Legitimate Use

It is well established that there is a shifting evidential burden under this limb. Where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of proof on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. See WIPO Case No. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d. d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd..

Past panels have held that a respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the WHOIS information was not similar to the disputed domain name. See the Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group. The Respondent is not known by the disputed name in the WHOIS.

There could be fair or legitimate use if the site was about the Complainant’s coaching, but it is not, it is a commercial offer and it actively promotes and offers courses described as “UEFA Coaching License” programmes and represents that those courses are accredited by UEFA. The site further claims that its courses are recognized by UEFA and numerous national football federations and encourages users to enrol in paid certification programmes. The website to which the disputed domain resolved contains an address situated in Manchester, England and purports to be connected to the FA, the Football Association for England. Under the header “Our Partners”, the website also claims to be partnered with a variety of other football associations including Germany, Republic of Ireland and the United States of America. There is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has been authorized by the Complainant or The FA in the issuance of UEFA coaching licenses and the Complainant says it has not been. These representations falsely imply an affiliation with the Complainant. UEFA coaching licenses are issued through recognized national football associations under the UEFA Coaching Convention and cannot be offered by an unauthorized third party. Similar findings were made in the case of Union Des Associations Européennes De Football ('UEFA') v. Rick Sorentos / GoldDay Corporation. CAC UDRP Case No. 104137 [<womenseuro.com> <womenseuro2022.com>].

The evidence also includes a complaint by an individual who enrolled in one of the courses promoted through the website and paid a total of €2,660 for what was presented as a UEFA C Coaching Course. Despite making those payments, the individual received nothing in return: no course access, no educational materials, and no certification process. The website therefore appears not to have been used to provide genuine training services at all.

The Panel considers that the use of a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s mark to solicit payments for non-existent courses cannot possibly constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Nor can it be legitimate non-commercial or fair use. Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not come forward to rebut that. In these circumstances the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Bad faith

As to bad faith, this will often follow the finding on the second limb. Given that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as the sale of a fictious license or diploma counterfeit goods or phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly evidence of bad faith.

Here the UEFA mark is famous. The composition of the disputed domain name — combining the UEFA mark with the words “coaching license” — directly targets the Complainant’s system of coaching qualifications. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent registered the domain name without knowledge of the Complainant. The use made of the disputed domain name confirms that the Respondent registered it with the intention of misleading Internet users and moreover offering fictious license or diplomas. Panels consistently find there is no legitimate use where a domain is used for “phishing, impersonation, or other types of fraud”, including schemes to obtain money or personal data. The website associated with the domain name promoted courses described as official UEFA coaching licences and represented that they were accredited by UEFA. We know from the complaint in evidence that at least one individual paid €2,660 to enrol in one of these purported courses on the website at which the disputed domain name resolves and received no course access, materials, or services whatsoever. The Respondent subsequently sought

additional payments and requested sensitive personal documents including criminal background information. This evidence demonstrates that the disputed domain name was used to create the false impression of an official UEFA training programme in order to induce payments from individuals seeking legitimate coaching qualifications. This is unlawful and worse.

These are serious allegations and yet the Respondent has not come forward to answer them. The use of a domain name incorporating a complainant's mark to facilitate unlawful schemes constitutes clear evidence of bad faith under the Policy. Taking all of these circumstances into account, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel orders that the domain name uefacoachinglicense.com 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. **uefacoachinglicense.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Victoria McEvedy**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-18

Publish the Decision