

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108677

Case number CAC-UDRP-108677

Time of filing 2026-05-26 07:33:26

Domain names paysend24.net

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization PaySend Group Limited

Complainant representative

Organization Motsnyi IP Group (dba Motsnyi Legal)

Respondent

Name Natalya Andreeva

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 PaySend Group Limited is the registered owner of many trademarks worldwide consisting and/or containing PAYSEND, e.g. International Registration No.1251936 "PaySend" (word), registered on April 10, 2015 for services in class 36 and designating amongst others the European Union.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is a global FinTech company headquartered in the UK and its subsidiaries are located in various countries, including the US, Ireland and Serbia. It started its business in 2017 and currently serves over ten million customers and operates in over 170 countries globally. It is one of the leaders in the area of online money transfers.

The Complainant also uses the domain name <paysend.com> for its official website.

The disputed domain name <paysend24.net> was registered on May 8, 2026. Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering competing online payment and money transfer services. In addition, MX records have been set up for the disputed domain name. Finally, the Respondent's address provided by the Registrar in Registrar verification does not exist.

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

1. Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the complainant must establish rights in a trademark or service mark, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights.

It results from the evidence provided, that the Complainant is the registered owner of PaySend trademarks.

Prior UDRP panels have found that a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark where the disputed domain name incorporates the complainant's trademark in its entirety (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1") at section 1.7. This Panel shares this view and notes that the Complainant's registered trademark PaySend is fully included in the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms (here the numerals "24") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Finally, the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".net" of the disputed domain name may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1 at section 1.11.

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant must secondly establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy contains a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be proved, shall demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain name.

In the Panel's view, based on the undisputed allegations stated above, the Complainant has made a prima facie case that none of these circumstances are found in the case at hand and, therefore, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the

disputed domain name.

According to the Complaint, which has remained unchallenged, the Complainant has no relationship in any way with the Respondent and did, in particular, not authorize the Respondent's use of the Complainant's trademark, e.g. by registering the disputed domain name, comprising said trademark entirely. Furthermore, the Panel notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name contains the Complainant's trademark entirely plus numerals 24, which might indicate availability of the services for 24 hours, so that this Panel finds it most likely that this signals an intention on the part of the Respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant, which uses the domain name <paysend.com> for its official website.

This is also confirmed by the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves (a website offering competing services) and MX records have been set up for the disputed domain name.

It is acknowledged that once the Panel finds a prima facie case is made by a complainant, the burden of production under the second element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.1 at section 2.1). Since the Respondent in the case at hand failed to come forward with any allegations or evidence, this Panel finds, in the circumstances of this case, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. According to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must thirdly establish that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Policy indicates that certain circumstances specified in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy may, "in particular but without limitation", be evidence of the disputed domain name's registration and use in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1. In this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the Panel's findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

(i) the nature of the disputed domain name (i.e., incorporating the Complainant's mark plus the addition of term which is related to the Complainant's business activity or natural zone of expansion).

(ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name directed (i.e. website offering competing online payment and money transfer services);

(iii) the fact that the disputed domain name has been connected to active MX records so that Respondent could be engaged in a phishing scheme;

(iv) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondents choice of the disputed domain name;

(iv) Finally, the use of false contact details to hide the registrant's identity (in fact the CAC was not able to send the written notice to the Respondent as the address provided by the Registrar in Registrar verification does not exist. The postal service provider was not able to deliver a written notice to such address).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore satisfied 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. **paysend24.net**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dr. Federica Togo
------	--------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-06

Publish the Decision
