Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109000

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109000
Time of filing	2026-09-18 10:22:44
Domain names	jagexltd.com, jagexlauncher.org, jagexlauncher.net, jagexlauncher.app

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Jagex Ltd

Complainant representative

Organization	Stobbs IP

Respondents

Name	Waleed Mahmood
Organization	Netacel Inc.
Organization	Njalla Okta LLC

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Complainant refers to earlier Nominet DRS proceedings concerning a related domain name <jagexlauncher.co.uk>, which included settlement discussions involving some of the disputed domain names. The present proceedings confirm that no settlement was reached regarding these disputed domain names.

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 is the holder of registered JAGEX trademarks, including:

- JAGEX, United Kingdom trademark No. UK00002302759, registered on 8 November 2002 in classes 9, 41 and 42;

- JAGEX, United States trademark No. 2860020, registered on 6 July 2004 in classes 9, 41 and 42; and

- JAGEX, European Union trademark No. 002943884, registered on 31 January 2005 in classes 9, 41 and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Jagex Limited, is a company incorporated in the United Kingdom in April 2000. It designs, develops, publishes and operates online video games, including RuneScape and Old School RuneScape, and uses the JAGEX mark in connection with its business. It operates a website at <jagex.com>. The Complainant is the owner of registered JAGEX trademarks in various jurisdictions.

The disputed domain names <jagexltd.com>, <jagexlauncher.org>, <jagexlauncher.net> and <jagexlauncher.app> were registered on 19 September 2025, 26 June 2026, 2 July 2026 and 13 July 2026, respectively.

According to the Complainant's evidence, the disputed domain names <jagexlauncher.org> and <jagexlauncher.net> both resolved to an identical web page resembling the Complainant's official website, mentioning the Complainant's JAGEX mark and RuneScape products.

The Complainant claims that the disputed domain name <jagexltd.com> had a redirect link to another domain name <jagexlauncher.co.uk>, which resolved to the same web page as the disputed domain names mentioned above. The redirect cannot be confirmed. The Complainant refers to recent Nominet DRS proceedings concerning the domain name <jagexlauncher.co.uk>. Through a quick search, the Panel was able to confirm that this domain name has been transferred to the Complainant on 20 October 2026.

According to the Complainant's evidence, the last disputed domain name <jagexlauncher.app> resolved to an inactive page.

The disputed domain names currently do not appear to resolve to active websites.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names 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 names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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.

Consolidation of Respondents

The Complaint concerns four disputed domain names registered in the names of nominally different Respondents. Paragraph 3(c) of the 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 nevertheless permitted consolidation of multiple respondents where the disputed domain names or the websites to which they resolve are subject to common control and consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties.

The Panel notes the following circumstances relied upon by the Complainant:

- All four disputed domain names incorporate the JAGEX trademark, and three follow the same “jagexlauncher” naming pattern;

- The disputed domain names were registered within a period of approximately ten months, three of them within less than three weeks;

- The registrant information disclosed for the disputed domain names <jagexltd.com> and <jagexlauncher.org> identifies the same individual. Whilst the registrant of <jagexltd.com> is identified only by initials, those initials correspond exactly with the full name disclosed for the registrant of <jagexlauncher.org>. Further, both domain names disclose the same email and physical addresses;

- The Complainant's evidence shows that the websites associated with the disputed domain names <jagexlauncher.org> and <jagexlauncher.net> were identical;

- Although the redirect is not confirmed, the Complainant submits that disputed domain name <jagexltd.com> redirected to a domain name <jagexlauncher.co.uk> resolving to the same website;

- The name disclosed for the registrant of <jagexlauncher.org> also corresponds to the name of the registrant of <jagexlauncher.co.uk>.

No one has come forward to contest the Complainant’s consolidation request or the evidence relied upon in support of it.

On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are subject to common control and that consolidation is fair and equitable and promotes procedural efficiency. The Panel therefore grants the consolidation request and refers to the nominal Respondents collectively as the “Respondent” below.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer a domain name. As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

Thus, for the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

1. The domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain names; and
3. The domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel has therefore dealt with each of these requirements in turn.

1. Identity or confusing similarity

The Complainant must first establish that there is a trademark or service mark in which it has rights. Since the Complainant is the holder of registered JAGEX trademarks, it is established that there are trademarks in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain names all incorporate the Complainant’s JAGEX trademark in its entirety, merely adding the terms “ltd” or "launcher" respectively. In each case, the Complainant’s trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. The Panel finds that the addition of these other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element (see section 1.8 WIPO Overview 3.1).

It is well established that the Top Level Domain (“TLD”) may be disregarded when considering whether a disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights (see section 1.11 WIPO Overview 3.1).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s JAGEX trademark. Accordingly, the Complainant has made out the first of the three elements that it must establish.

2. No rights or legitimate interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of establishing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. It is established case law that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names in order to shift the burden of production to the Respondent (see section 2.1 WIPO Overview 3.1).

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain names and there is no evidence that the Respondent has acquired corresponding trademark or service mark rights. The Respondent’s use and registration of the

disputed domain names was not authorized by the Complainant. There are no indications that any connection between the Complainant and the Respondent existed.

A respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. The correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often central to this inquiry. Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner (see section 2.5.1 WIPO Overview 3.1).

All disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's distinctive JAGEX trademark in its entirety. The term "ltd" is an abbreviation for "limited", which corresponds to the Complainant's corporate designation. The Complainant's evidence confirms that the term "launcher" is associated with software used to start applications or games. In the context of the Complainant's online gaming business, the Panel therefore finds that these combinations may suggest an official company website or a game-launching service associated with the Complainant, and cannot constitute fair use.

In addition, the Complainant's evidence indicates that at least two disputed domain names resolved to websites imitating the Complainant's official website, mentioning the Complainant's JAGEX mark and RuneScape products. In the Panel's view, such apparent impersonation is inconsistent with a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use (see section 2.13.1 WIPO Overview 3.1).

The fact that some disputed domain names did or do not resolve to an active website does not change the Panel's finding. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant succeeds on the second element of the Policy.

3. Bad faith

The Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith and that they are being used in bad faith.
Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that evidence of bad faith registration and use may consist of circumstances indicating that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or of a product or service on that website.

According to the Panel, awareness by a respondent of the complainant and/or the complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration can evidence bad faith. In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain names. All disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's distinctive JAGEX trademark in its entirety and combine it with abbreviations or terms related to the Complainant or its business. The Complainant's JAGEX trademark rights also predate the registration of the disputed domain names by more than 20 years. Finally, the content of the websites associated with some of the disputed domain names reinforces the inference of deliberate targeting.

The evidence indicates that at least two disputed domain names have been used to direct Internet users to a website which imitated the Complainant's online presence and presented game-related content or downloads as connected with the Complainant. The Panel considers that such conduct is intended to attract Internet users by creating confusion as to source, sponsorship or affiliation of the Respondent's website. Given that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith (see section 3.1.4 WIPO Overview 3.1).

The fact that some disputed domain names did or do not resolve to active websites does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding (see section 3.3 WIPO Overview 3.1). In the circumstances of this case, including the composition of the disputed domain names and the absence of any apparent good-faith use, the Panel considers it implausible that the disputed domain names could be put to any good-faith use unrelated to the Complainant.

In addition to the disputed domain names, the Complainant refers to two other domain names which have been subject to separate proceedings decided in favour of the Complainant and can be linked to the registrant information disclosed in the present proceedings. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct of targeting the Complainant's JAGEX trademark.

Finally, the Respondent did not formally take part in the administrative proceedings. According to the Panel, this serves as an additional indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, it is sufficiently shown that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **jagexltd.com**: Transferred
2. **jagexlauncher.org**: Transferred
3. **jagexlauncher.net**: Transferred
4. **jagexlauncher.app**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Flip Petillion**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-02

Publish the Decision