Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108883

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108883
Time of filing	2026-07-29 16:09:41
Domain names	docomo-up.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	NTT DOCOMO, INC.

Complainant representative

Organization	Rodenbaugh Law LLC

Respondent

Name	lin da he

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 relies on its registration of the word mark DOCOMO in Japan in class 38 on 31 May 1996 pursuant to an application filed on 2 September 1992, as well as various registered logos and device marks containing the word DOCOMO.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the predominant mobile telecommunications operator in Japan, serving over 73 million customers. It was spun off from Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation (NTT) in 1992. NTT filed an application to register DOCOMO as a word mark for mobile telephone communication services the same year, which was granted in 1996 and has been used by the Complainant as its primary mark with NTT’s consent. The Complainant launched the world's first commercial 3G network in 2001 and is a leading developer of 5G networks.

The disputed domain name was originally registered by an unknown third party on 10 January 2026 and used between 10 and 15 January 2026 to carry out a phishing scheme targeting the Complainant's customers. Fraudulent e-mails impersonating the Complainant were sent to consumers, directing recipients to a web page that announced a bogus "security upgrade" and induced them to allow access to their user account credentials, passwords and credit card information, enabling these to be harvested.

On 14 January 2026 the Complainant published a warning notice on its website relating to this phishing scheme. On 16 January

2026 the initial registration of the disputed domain name was cancelled during the 5-day grace period following registration, with the consequence that it did not appear on expiring names lists monitored by back-order services and drop-catch platforms. Despite this, the disputed domain name was registered the same day, 16 January 2026, by the Respondent. Since then, the disputed domain name has not resolved to any active webpage.

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 Panel finds that the Complainant has rights in the registered mark DOCOMO which it has used and is using as its principal mark with the consent of the registered owner, NTT. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name contains this mark in its entirety followed by a hyphen and the word "up" and the generic top level domain name suffix. The Panel considers that these additions are insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the mark.

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 Panel finds on the undisputed evidence that the Respondent has not used or made any preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Panel also accepts the Complainant's undisputed evidence that it did not authorise the Respondent to use or register the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any corresponding name.

In these circumstances, 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

Given the extent of the Complainant's business and reputation and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that it is inherently unlikely that it was registered and that its retention and passive use by the Respondent are in good faith. In the absence of any satisfactory explanation rebutting this inference, the Panel is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name was registered the same day as it was cancelled in circumstances where the cancellation was not circulated on expiring names lists monitored by back-order services and drop-catch platforms. This suggests that the Respondent is associated in some way with the original registrant who evidently registered the disputed domain name in bad faith to carry out a phishing scheme. Although the Complaint drew attention to this, no explanation was provided by the Respondent, and it is reasonable to draw the inference that the Respondent is not innocent of involvement in the phishing scheme.

In these circumstances, 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

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's word mark followed by a hyphen and the word "up". The Panel finds that it is confusingly similar to this mark.

The Panel is satisfied on the undisputed evidence that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed name, which (on the evidence) has not been used for any legitimate purpose and is not a name by which the Respondent is commonly known.

The Panel also finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It is inherently unlikely that such a domain name would be registered and used in good faith. In the absence of any explanation by the Respondent it is therefore reasonable to infer that it was registered and is being used in bad faith, and this is reinforced by undisputed evidence suggesting complicity in an earlier Respondent's phishing scheme.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **docomo-up.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Turner**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-14

Publish the Decision