# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108471

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108471 |
| Time of filing | 2026-03-16 09:28:57 |
| Domain names | paypalcoinc.com |

## Case administrator

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

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | PayPal, Inc. |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Stobbs IP |

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Mariam Douf |

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 holds a large portfolio for PAYPAL trademarks in different jurisdictions around the world. By way of example and before the United States Patent and Trademark Office, registration No. 3069209, registered on March 14, 2006 or registration No. 5370326 registered on January 2, 2018.

The Panel recognizes the distinctive and well-known character of Complainant´s PAYPAL trademark.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an online payment company seated in the United States of America doing business in more than 200 markets.

The Complainant’s mobile phone app has been downloaded more than 100 million times from different platforms. In 2020 its revenue was over 21.5 billion USD. The Complainant has made a significant use of social media to promote its services.

The disputed domain name <paypalcoinc.com> was registered on February 26, 2026 and at the moment of the file of this Complaint the disputed domain name was inactive. However, previously the disputed domain name directed to an active site offering cryptocurrency investments and where a Complainant´s modified version of its logo was displayed.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

THE COMPLAINANT

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

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent incorporated the PAYPAL mark in its entirety as the distinctive and dominant element of the disputed domain name. Indeed, says the Complainant, by adding a descriptive term, eg. “coinc”, the confusion between the disputed domain name and the registered mark increases.

The Complainant supports a finding that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as set up in Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. That it is to say, the Respondent has not been commonly known by the domain name, the previous use of the former active website was part of a phishing and/or spam campaign targeting the Complainant and its customers and, nothing in this dispute suggests that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

With regard the third element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent had knowledge of its PAYPAL trademark and that the disputed domain name was registered to target Complainant’s Registered trademarks. Further, the passive holding doctrine applies in this case.

THE RESPONDENT

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

1. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the PAYPAL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. From a comparison between the disputed domain name and the Complainant´s trademark it seems apparent that the former reproduces the mark PAYPAL in the disputed domain name <paypalcoinc.com>. The Respondent simply added the term “coin” plus the letter “c”. Therefore, confusion is met in terms of the Policy.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element test.

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

2. Rights or Legitimate Interest

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out non-exclusive examples in which the Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, while the burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible task of "proving a negative". Accordingly, panels have established, since the inception of the Policy, that it is sufficient to raise a prima facie case against the respondent and then the evidential burden of production shifts to the respondent. See CAC-UDRP-106452.

The Panel finds that the circumstances referred in paragraph 4(c) do not apply to the Respondent or, even any other legitimate circumstance that may apply in favour to the Respondent. Indeed, the composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved suggest impersonation which cannot grant rights or legitimate interests.

As noted, PAYPAL is a well-known trademark and is also a leading actor in online payment transactions through the internet. While there is no evidence of any trademark for the Respondent, the Panel finds that he targeted the PAYPAL trademark in order to arise as someone associated with the Complainant. However, this association or relation does not exist. Thus, the Panel cannot find rights or legal interest for the Respondent.

Besides, the silence of the Respondent, once it received the Complaint, has prevented the Panel from assessing if any circumstances may oppose the Complainant´s prima facie showing.

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

3. Register and Used in Bad Faith

On balance the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name <paypalcoinc.com> due to its reputation and distinctiveness. This previous knowledge is strengthened with the later reproduction of a modified version of its logo in the corresponding site.

Furthermore, the Panel notes the short period of time between the registration of the disputed domain name and the filing of the Complaint. However, the Respondent has been active. Initially, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website where the Respondent gave the false impression to be someone affiliated or related to the Complainant and, nowadays the disputed domain name is inactive. None of such circumstances provide bona fide use in terms of the Policy. Both, the attempt to present oneself as someone affiliated to the Complainant or, the failure to use the disputed domain name, tantamount to a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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. **paypalcoinc.com**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Manuel Moreno-Torres** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-16

Publish the Decision