

DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE

D00023962

Decision of Independent Expert (Summary Decision)

Skyscanner Limited

and

travel by air

1. The Parties:

Complainant: Skyscanner Limited
Floor 11, Regent's Place, 338 Euston Road
London
Greater London
NW1 3BT
United Kingdom

Respondent: travel by air
hno main jaitpur road molarband extn 1045
Badarpur
Delhi
110044
India

2. The Disputed Domain Name:

<skyscannertravels.uk>

3. Notification of Complaint

I hereby certify that I am satisfied that Nominet has sent the complaint to the Respondent in accordance with section 3 and 6 of the Policy.

Yes

4. Rights

The Complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the domain name.

Yes

5. Abusive Registration

The Complainant has, to my reasonable satisfaction, shown that the domain name skyscannertravels.uk is an abusive registration

Yes

6. Other Factors

I am satisfied that no other factors apply which would make a summary decision unconscionable in all the circumstances

Yes

1. Comments

The Complainant's SKYSCANNER mark ("Mark") was registered at least as early as 17 May 2010. The Complainant's free on-line travel services are widely known and the Marks enjoy a global reputation. This has been especially so since, in November 2016, China's largest on-line travel service, C-Trip, acquired the Complainant for GBP 1.4 billion.

The Respondent, "travel by air", registered the Disputed Domain Name on 22 July 2021. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Mark in its entirety. Moreover, the addition of the generic word "travels", which describes the Complainant's core services, serves to enhance identity, rather than distinguishing the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant has adduced evidence showing that the Respondent's website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves is associated with various email addresses. The Complainant avers that in past UDRP cases involving misuse of its Mark, associated email addresses have been found by earlier panels to have been used as a tool for conducting "phishing" scams, where the addresses were used to impersonate the Complainant to contact and defraud unsuspecting consumers. The Complainant urges that no plausible explanation exists for registering a virtually

identical domain name to the Complainant's Mark, other than to take advantage of the Complainant's Rights for illicit gain. This Expert agrees and so finds.

8. Decision

I grant the Complainant's application for a summary decision. In accordance with section 12 of the Policy, the domain name will therefore be transferred to the Complainant.

Signed:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Markus' or similar, written over a horizontal line.

Dated: 07 September 2021