

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108829

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108829
Time of filing	2026-07-10 16:53:23
Domain names	noragotv.net , noraip.tv

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	------------------------------------

Complainant

Organization	Setplex LLC
--------------	--------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Trama Legal s.r.o.
--------------	---------------------------

Respondents

Name	Hasnat Ahmed
Name	Jordan White

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns the US national word trade mark NORAGO, registration number 5794377, first registered on 2 July 2019 in international class 9; the US national word and device trade mark NORA GO, registration number 8129392, first registered on 3 February 2026 in international class 9; the US national word trade mark NORA, registration number 5832354, first registered on 13 August 2019 in international classes 9 and 42; and the stylised US national word trade mark NORA, registration number 8129367, first registered on 3 February 2026 in international classes 9 and 42.

The aforementioned trade mark registration NORAGO, registration number 5794377, predates registration of the disputed domain name <noragotv.net> on 20 June 2025. By contrast, registration of the word and device trade mark NORA GO, registration number 8129392, postdates registration of the disputed domain name <noragotv.net>. Registration of the word trade mark NORA, registration number 5832354, predates registration of the disputed domain name <noraip.tv> on 9 February 2023, whereas registration of the stylised US national word trade mark NORA, registration number 8129367, postdates registration of the disputed domain name <noraip.tv>. Identification of the Complainant's rights serves as a threshold requirement to confirm standing in UDRP proceedings (regardless of whether they predate or postdate registration of the disputed domain names) and the Complainant has in any event shown that it owns trade mark rights which predate registration of the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, the Complainant states that it owns (but the Panel notes that it is not the registrant) of the domain name <norago.tv>,

registered on 31 March 2018. However, the domain name resolves to an error page, whereas the Complainant appears in fact to use the domain name <noragotv.com> to connect to the Complainant's official website through which it informs Internet users and consumers about its products and services offered under the name NORAGO. In any event, the Panel notes by reference to the Complainant's submissions that ownership of a domain name does not constitute a trade mark or service mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

It is unknown from the amended complaint what the Complainant does. A brief internet search by the Panel suggests that the Complainant is an online video delivery technology company that provides end-to-end OTT (Over-The-Top) and IPTV software solutions for broadcasters, operators, and media providers, including content ingestion and delivery, management, monetization, and multi-screen apps. Norago TV appears to be a commercial IPTV (Internet Protocol Television) subscription service that sells access credentials to stream live television, movies, and sports over the internet. The service operates as a third-party provider, meaning that Norago TV does not host, own, or stream the content directly. Instead, it resells digital subscriptions consisting of system-generated usernames, passwords, and server playlist URLs. Users purchase these credentials and enter them into compatible video players to unlock their media access.

The disputed domain name <noragotv.net> was registered on 20 June 2026 and, as at 12 March 2026, resolved to a webpage offering IPTV services under the name Norago TV. As at the date of this decision, the disputed domain name <noragotv.net> resolves to an inactive page. The disputed domain name <noraip.tv> was registered on 9 February 2023 and resolves to an active website hosting IP TV services under the name NORA IP TV.

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 that the disputed domain name <noragotv.net> is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark 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 <noragotv.net> (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the disputed domain name <noragotv.net> has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The present proceeding raises a number of procedural issues as follows.

First, the case administrator obtained express confirmation that the CAC is accredited to administer <.TV> domain disputes. The Panel is therefore satisfied that it has jurisdiction in principle to make a determination with regard to the disputed domain name <noraip.tv>, subject to the question of consolidation of the complaints in this proceeding, as to which see below.

Secondly, the registration of the disputed domain name <noragotv.net> expired prior to the filing of the complaint. However, the disputed domain name has since been renewed, the disputed domain name presently remains locked, and it therefore forms the subject of this proceeding.

Thirdly, the complainant requests that its complaints against the Respondents be consolidated into one proceeding. Paragraph 10(e) of the UDRP Rules grants the Panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. At the same time, paragraph 3(c) of the UDRP Rules provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. UDRP panels have looked to a variety of factors, which are typically present in some combination, to determine whether multiple domain names are, in fact, in common ownership and control (see WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 4.11.2) and whether such consolidation is appropriate.

The Panel notes the Complainant's lengthy submissions in support of its request for consolidation of the complaints into a single proceeding but the Panel does not consider that the evidence adduced by the Complainant is sufficient to point to likely common control of the disputed domain names. The Panel therefore does not grant the Complainant's request to consolidate the complaints against the two disputed domain names, including for the following reasons:

- The names, addresses and contact details of the Respondents are different for the two disputed domain names. While the Complainant adduces evidence to demonstrate that the Whois information provided by the registrant of the disputed domain name <noraip.tv> is likely to be false, this does not lead to the conclusion that the Whois information for the second domain name <nragotv.net> is also false, or that both registrants are identical.
- The disputed domain names were registered some years apart and are hosted by different registrars.
- The Complainant argues that both disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trade marks and add descriptive elements referring to IP and/or TV, which is the Complainant's field of activity. However, the naming pattern for the two disputed domains differs (insofar as they relate to different trade marks of the Complainant and they use different domain extensions) and the combination of a trade mark with descriptive elements is typical of cybersquatting cases and does not in itself point to common ownership of the disputed domain names.
- The Complainant points to both disputed domain names resolving to very similar subscription storefronts, with similar content and layout, and offering similar packages and features for IPTV/OTT television services. However, these packages and features appear to the Panel to be not untypical of the IPTV/OTT services environment and therefore do not necessarily point to common ownership of the disputed domain names.
- While both websites accessed through the disputed domain names use the same payment portal, with near identical appearances, and in both cases only accept either PayPal or cryptocurrency as payment options, the Complainant acknowledges that the WHMCS billing portal is a widely licensed commercial product. Again, use of a common, widely commercially available billing portal, does not therefore necessarily point to common ownership of the disputed domain names. The Panel notes further that the check-out pages on the two websites resolve to different URLs.

The remainder of the present decision is therefore only concerned with the first disputed domain name <noragotv.net>. The Panel invites the Complainant to file a separate complaint with regard to the second disputed domain name <noraip.tv> and makes no further findings with regard to the second disputed domain name in this decision.

The Panel is satisfied that all other 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

With regard to the first UDRP element, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <noragotv.net> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark NORAGO. Indeed, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trade mark in its entirety but adds the descriptive abbreviation "tv" (as an abbreviation for the word "television") as a suffix to the Complainant's trade mark. The Panel follows in this respect the view established by numerous other decisions that a domain name which wholly incorporates a Complainant's registered trade mark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for the purposes of the UDRP (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasily Terkin <porsche-autoparts.com>). The Panel further considers it to be well established that the addition of a descriptive or generic term does not allow a domain name to avoid confusing similarity with a trade mark (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2019-2294, Qantas Airways Limited v. Quality Ads <qantaslink.com>; and CAC Case No. 102137, Novartis AG v. Black Roses <novartiscorp.com>). Other panels have previously found that "[W]here the relevant trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element" (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8; and, for example, WIPO Case No. D2023-2542, Merryvale Limited v. tao tao <wwwbetway.com>; and WIPO Case No. D2020-0528, Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Rich Ardeia <global-iqos.com>). Against this background, the Panel finds that the addition of the abbreviation "tv" to the Complainant's trade mark is not sufficient to alter the overall impression of the designation as being connected with the Complainant's trade mark and does not prevent a likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and its trade mark. To the contrary, the disputed domain name rather adds to the likelihood of confusion because the addition of the abbreviation "tv", in conjunction with the Complainant's trade mark NORAGO, suggests that the disputed domain name links to an official website of the Complainant, which is an IP TV services provider, and carries the implication that it is linked to the Complainant and its business.

With regard to the second UDRP element, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolved to a website using the Complainant's trade mark and a logo which, while not identical to the Complainant's word and device trademark NORA GO, was certainly confusingly similar and sought to imitate the Complainant's branding. The website accessed through the disputed domain name included an e-commerce functionality and offered for sale a range of IPTV/OTT subscription services similar to those offered by the Complainant by reference to the Complainant's trade mark. The Panel accepts that the website accessed through the disputed domain name carried a high risk of affiliation with the Complainant, suggesting that it was either the Complainant's own

website, or was at least endorsed by the Complainant, where this was not the case. The Panel further accepts the Complainant's submissions that the Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant in any way, and is neither licensed nor otherwise authorised to make any use of the Complainant's trade mark, or to apply for or use the disputed domain name. Indeed, the website accessed through the disputed domain name did not identify who owns and operates it and did not clearly and prominently identify the registrant's relationship with the Complainant. In those circumstances, the Panel accepts that the website accessed through the disputed domain name took unfair advantage of the Complainant's trade mark for the purpose of attracting or diverting traffic to that website for commercial gain, and also for the purpose of misleading Internet users as to the origin of the services offered. The Panel therefore concludes that the website to which the disputed domain name resolved did not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Furthermore, the Whois information does not suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name <noragotv.net>. 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, as is equally not the case here (see, for example, Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> ("Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as "Chad Moston / Elite Media Group." The Panel therefore finds under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii)."). Neither is there any indication that the Respondent is making any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Against this background, and absent any response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

With regard to the third UDRP element, the Panel notes again that the logo used by the Respondent on its website was confusingly similar to the Complainant's word and device trade mark NORA GO. It is therefore reasonable to infer that the Respondent either knew, or should have known, that the disputed domain name would be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark, and that he registered the disputed domain name in full knowledge of the Complainant's trade mark. If the Respondent had carried out a Google search for the term "NoragoTV", the search results would have yielded immediate results related to the Complainant, its websites, and its connected business, products and services. Indeed, it is likely that the disputed domain would not have been registered if it were not for the Complainant's trade mark (see, for example, WIPO Case No D2004-0673 Ferrari Spa -v- American Entertainment Group Inc). The Panel notes that the Respondent sought to attract and divert Internet users to his own website for commercial gain, based on the Complainant's trade mark, which constitutes further evidence of bad faith (see, for example, WIPO Case No D2018-0497, StudioCanal v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Sudjam Admin, Sudjam LLC ("In that circumstance, whether the commercial gain from misled Internet users is gained by the Respondent or by the Registrar (or by another third party), it remains that the Respondent controls and cannot (absent some special circumstance) disclaim responsibility for, the content appearing on the website to which the disputed domain name resolve [...] so the Panel presumes that the Respondent has allowed the disputed domain name to be used with the intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website to which the disputed domain name resolves. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.")). Absent any response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel therefore also accepts that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Partially Accepted/Partially Rejected

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

- 1. **noragotv.net**: Transferred
- 2. **noraip.tv**: Terminated (consolidation not granted)

PANELLISTS

Name	Gregor Kleinknecht LLM MCIArb
------	-------------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-07

Publish the Decision