Code:
Date: 25 June 2026

Palestinian National Internet Naming Authority, PNINA
ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jagex Limited , 220 Cambridge Science Park
Cambridge, England, CB4 0WA, United Kingdom

Versus

NJALLA/*Host Master, 1337 Services LLC, P.O. Box 590, Charlestown, KN0802, Saint Kitts And Nevis*

PNINA Case No. D2026-001

1. The Parties

a) The Complainant: in this administrative proceeding is Jagex Limited, (Company number 03982706) of 220 Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge, England, CB4 0WA.

The Complainant's contact details are:
Address:
220 Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge, England, CB4 0WA
Email: jagex@iamstobbs.com
The complainant's authorised legal representative in this administrative proceeding is Stobbs IP Ltd:
Address:
Building 1000, Cambridge Research Park, Cambridge, CB25 9PD, United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 1223 435240
Email: jagex@iamstobbs.com / tosshan.ramgolam@iamstobbs.com
Contact: Steven Ustel / Tosshan Ramgolam
Address:
Building 1000, Cambridge Research Park, Cambridge, CB25 9PD, United Kingdom
Fax: +44 1223 435240

b) The Respondent:
NJALLA/Hostmaster,
1337 Services LLC,
P.O. Box 590,
Charlestown, KN0802,
Saint Kitts And Nevis
Email: whois@njal.la
Phone Number: +883.510008346319

The Respondent has not assigned any legal representative to this administrative proceeding.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

a. The disputed domain name <**FEROX.PS**> (**Domain Name**) was initially registered in 22nd of January 2025
b. Domain Name Brief History:
    i. Creation date: 22 January 2025
        1. Registrant: NJALLA/Hostmaster
        2. Registrar: Sarek (sarek4ps)
    ii. Renewal date: 10 January 2026 for 1 year by Sarek4ps.
    iii. Expiration date: 22 January 2027.
c. **Current Registrar Contact Information:**
    Name: Immaterialism Ltd
    Email tld-ps@immateriali.sm
    Phone +447418378322
    Fax +447418378322
    Address:
    Piccadilly Business Centre
    Unit C, Aldow Enterprise Park
    Manchester,M12 6AE,England
    United Kingdom

Procedural History

On 20th of April 2026, PNINA received a complaint from Tosshan Ramgolam (IA Trainee/Brand Protection), Stobbs Company as a representative of Jagex Company which detailed a dispute resolution arbitration agreement and a complaint against the current registrar of the <FEROX.PS> domain name.

PNINA verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the ".ps" Domain Registration Policy (the "Policy"), the adopted Rules for ".ps" Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the ICANN's Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy and Rules available at http://www.icann.org/udrp/udrp-policy-24oct99.htm (the UDRP Policy and Rules). PNINA confirmed receiving the complaint and forwarded the Arbitration Acceptance Form to the Complainant. PNINA reviewed the signed forms and supported documents and decided to initiate a dispute resolution process since all requirements have been satisfied for such a process based on PNINA's own rules and DRP policies and procedures.

After the 3-days' time frame set in PNINA's Dispute Resolution Procedures available at (http://www.pnina.ps/pics/DRP-Chart.jpg), the Complainant was notified by PNINA of the acceptance of the complaint and that the complaint is administratively adequate to initiate a dispute resolution process and the official case number (D2026-001) was assigned.

On 28th of April 2026, PNINA approached the Respondent with an official letter explaining the case and asking for his/her response and acceptance of starting the DRP process. PNINA asked the respondent to sign the Arbitration Acceptance Form (in English) and the assignment of the Panel within the established deadlines. The domain

registrar (tld-ps@immateriali.sm) was carbon-copied in all communications between PNINA and the Respondent.

PNINA reminded the parties after through a gentle reminder email sent by PNINA on 6th May 2026. The official grace period expired at Close of Business of 6th of May 2026. PNINA has not received the Arbitration Acceptance Form or any justified response from the Respondent. The Registrar was also notified of the expiry of the deadline without any reply from the Respondent.

On 12th May 2026, and after the expiration of the deadlines sent to the Respondent, PNINA appointed Dr. Marwan M. Radwan as the sole panellist in this matter after receiving written approval from the Complainant to this appointment and the declination of the Respondent to respond to all communications from PNINA.

The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence to PNINA as required by the Policy to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

A request for registrant/registrar verification in connection with the domain name at issue was forwarded to PNINA by the Panellist and on the same day, PNINA transmitted by email its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and provided the contact details of the listed domain name.

On May 17th, 2022, the Arbitration Panelist (Dr. Marwan Radwan) reviewed all case documents and sent the legal bundle regarding the case to all parties and asked for their legal arguments and supporting documents to be presented before close of business on Monday, 1st of June 2026 in order to proceed with the case based on PNINA's DRP policies and procedures.

The forwarded legal bundle included 7 documents including the official complaint documents, arbitration forms and emails exchanged between PNINA, the Complainant and the Arbitration Panel.

No delegation or representation document or acceptance forms were received from the Respondent or the Current Certified Registrar. All communication were done through the officially registered contact information within PNINA domain registration records.

Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Based on the submitted Complainant documents, this complaint is based on the following grounds:

1. The Complainant is incorporated under the laws of England and Wales since 28 April 2000 as Jagex Limited (**Annex 2 of the Complainant Bundle**). Since then, the Complainant has carried on the business of designing, developing, publishing, and operating online video games and other electronic-based entertainment.
2. The Complainant is well-known internationally for its Massively Multiplayer Online Role-Playing Games ("MMORPG") RuneScape (**Annex 3 of the**

Complainant Bundle) and Old School RuneScape (**Annex 4 of the Complainant Bundle**), (collectively, the "**Games**"). Together, the **Games** average a total of more than 3 million active users per month since October 2022. Old School RuneScape has also been recognised by the Guinness World Records for being the largest free-to-play MMORPG with over 300 million accounts (**Annex 5 of the Complainant Bundle**).

3. The Complainant owns the domain name <runescape.com>, which has resolved to an active website relating to online video games since at least as early as 17 August 2000 (**Annex 6 of the Complainant Bundle**). In addition to <runescape.com>, the Complainant has acquired further domain names which incorporate the RUNE and RUNESCAPE trademarks and which resolve to active websites. Examples include <runescape.net> and <runeservice.com>. A non-exhaustive domain name schedule is attached (**Annex 7 of the Complainant Bundle**).
4. The Complainant is also active on social media and has generated a significant level of endorsement, and provided a detailed table of platforms, their games URLs and some metrics as shown in **Annex 8 of the Complainant Bundle**.
5. The Complainant has also received public and critical praise for its Games. For example, Old School RuneScape was awarded 2019 EE Mobile Game of the Year at the British Academy Games Awards, while maintaining a Metacritic score of 87, a 4.8 rating (out of 5) on the iOS App Store, and 14,252 "Very Positive" user ratings on Steam (**Annex 9 of the Complainant Bundle**).
6. The Complainant's Games have provided the stimulus for a substantial quantity of online user-generated content relating to the games, including blogs, online articles, forums, videos, message boards, as well as dedicated wikis (**Annex 10 of the Complainant Bundle**).
7. Consequently, the RUNESCAPE brand has achieved a high level of recognition globally. As shown by the number of high reviews the Games have received (**Annex 11 of the Complainant Bundle**).
8. The Complainant submits that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name is abusive under the PNINA .PS Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy.

B. Respondent

PNINA approached the Respondent in due course but he/she has not responded to any of the communications sent by PNINA within the stated deadline of the DRP policies and procedures.

Neither PNINA or the Arbitration Panellist received any communications from the Respondent or the current domain registrar regarding assigning a legal representative or delegating someone else to legally represent him in this case.

C. Due Process

The Panel is convinced that both the Complainant and the Respondent have been duly notified of this proceeding and that they have suffered no denial of due process. All subsequent communications with the parties were forwarded to the other party and the certified registrar of the domain to make sure all parties are fully aware of any additions or supplemental evidences submitted to the Panel.

Discussion and Findings

In accordance with Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel is instructed to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and **any principles of law that it deems applicab**le."

Pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(i) through (iii) of the Policy, the Complainant may prevail in these proceedings and be awarded the disputed domain names if the following are being proved:

A. The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
B. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
C. The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Complainant bears the burden of establishing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

A) The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights:

To support their claims, the Complainant addresses each of the above mention grounds as follows:

1- **Rights in 'FEROX' Name:**
   a. A key component of the Games' success is the distinctive and well-known characters, and places in which the Complainant invests heavily in developing extensive character biographies, lore, and character/environment designs.
   b. One of the most recognisable and iconic characters and locations is Ferox and the Ferox Enclave, first introduced in 2020, which remain central figures and location in the Old School RuneScape game to date.
   c. The Complainant is the registered proprietor of the FEROX trade mark.
   d. The Complainant relies on the general consensus principle held by prior panellists, that, provided a Complainant has a trade mark (in any jurisdiction) at the time of commencing proceedings, they will satisfy the threshold of holding rights for the purpose of Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(i).
   e. As a result of the substantial development period and use over the past 6 years, the FEROX mark has become synonymous with the Complainant and is perceived by consumers as originating from the Complainant.
   f. Based on the above submissions, the Complainant maintains that they hold rights in FEROX as per the Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(i).
2- **Comparison with the Disputed Domain Name:**

a. Turning to the second limb of Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(i), the Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to that of the Complainant's Mark.
b. The Disputed Domain Name wholly incorporates the Complainant's FEROX TradeMark verbatim.
c. In addition to the substantial following and recognition of the Complainant's Games and Mark, the Complainant submits that the content on the Disputed Domain Name is also a contributing factor to support the brands' reputation.
d. The <FEROX.PS> website historically resolved to a website promoting a pirated copy of the Complainant's Games, which evinces wilful targeting on behalf of the Respondent. The average internet user would associate the name FEROX and a pirated copy of the Complainant's Games to be related or associated with the Complainant. This is sufficient to establish the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Name.
e. The Complainant requests that the Panel omit the ccTLD suffix '.ps' when assessing the Disputed Domain Name as it is merely a technical requirement used for domain name registrations. The initials PS can be thought to refer to "Private Servers", the Respondent is operating a Private Server copy of the Complainant's Games. Therefore, the average internet user would associate a domain name featuring the Complainant's trade mark and the suffix '.ps' to be related to the Complainant.
f. Based on the foregoing, the Complainant submits that the domain name in question is confusingly similar to the Complainant's FEROX Mark.

B) **The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name:**
a. The Complainant submits that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name under Policy, Paragraph 4(c).
b. The Complainant acknowledges that a Respondent may demonstrate a right or legitimate interest in the domain name only if it can be established that:
i. *The Respondent's use of the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name is in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;*
ii. *The Respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if they have acquired no trade mark or service mark rights; or*
iii. *The Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent or commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers.*
c. The Complainant rebutted each of the above-mentioned defences.
d. The Complainant submits that the Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name to resolve to https://ferox.ps/ (the "**Website**") (see **Annex 15 of the Complainant Bundle**), which offers a pirated version of the Complainant's Old School RuneScape game. The creation and use of the pirated version of the game, not only

constitutes an infringement of the Complainant's registered trade mark and actionable passing off, but also a violation of the Complainant's EULA (see **Annex 16 of the Complainant Bundle**) and applicable copyright laws.

e. Further and in addition to the above, the Respondent's offering of a pirated version of the game unfairly competes with the Complainant's Games, specifically in relation to computer game programs and video game services; services protected by the Mark.
f. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has chosen to use the FEROX mark in the Disputed Domain Name, in order to take advantage of the goodwill generated by the Complainant's FEROX mark and well-established and successful online video game business, without the Respondent having to incur its own advertising or branding expenditure. This cannot constitute a *bona fide* offering of goods or services.
g. Consequently, the Respondent cannot claim a defence under Policy, Paragraph 4(c)(i).
h. Upon information and belief, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has never legitimately been known by the name FEROX at any point in time.

C) <u>The Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent of or commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers.</u>

a. The Complainant submits that nothing about the Disputed Domain Name suggests that it is being used by the Respondent legitimately or for non-commercial and fair use.
b. The Disputed Domain Name has been set-up to take advantage of the Complainant's significant goodwill and valuable reputation in order to promote a pirate copy of the official game for illegitimate financial gain, via donations. Given the commercial use of the Disputed Domain Name the Respondent cannot come within Policy, Paragraph 4(c)(iii).
c. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name. Consequently, the Respondent does not satisfy any of the above-mentioned grounds under Policy, Paragraph 4(c).

D) **<u>The domain name was registered or is being used in bad faith.</u>** (Policy, Paragraphs 4(a)(iii), 4(b); Rules, Paragraph 3(b)(ix)(3))

a. The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with Policy, Paragraph 4(a)(iii).

b. The Complainant reiterates the submissions made above that the Complainant enjoys a substantial reputation in the RUNESCAPE brand and FEROX mark which significantly pre-date the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

c. It is clear that the Respondent was unequivocally aware of the RUNESCAPE brand and FEROX mark, given the Respondent's deliberate impersonation and targeting of the Complainant's RUNESCAPE brand and FEROX mark, and the Complainant's RuneScape and Old School RuneScape in-game assets and mechanics.

d. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is free riding on the success of the FEROX mark and RuneScape brand including by use of the Complainant's well-known in-game assets and promotional material, including but not limited to following:

   i. to promote a pirated copy of the Old School RuneScape game made available for download (available at: https://ferox.ps/download, see **Annex 17 of the Complainant Bundle**), the game is a direct copy of Old School RuneScape;
   ii. Use of similar website templates for the Website's wiki, see comparison of the Website's wiki found here: https://wiki.ferox.ps/ against the Complainant's Wiki at **Annex 18 of the Complainant Bundle**; and The content on the Website's wiki relates to the Complainant's Games, see **Annex 19 of the Complainant Bundle**.
   iii. The Complainant submits that the only plausible explanation is the Respondent's service impersonates the Complainant's Games or otherwise intentionally targets the Complainant and adopts a term relating to the Complainant's Games with a view to diverting traffic from the Complainant's websites in order to promote a pirated copy of the Old School RuneScape game.
   iv. The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name was registered with prior knowledge of the Complainant's FEROX brand as evidenced by the use of the unique FEROX term, substantial similarity of in-game assets, naming conventions, and art style, with a view to taking advantage of the attractive power of those brands to consumers of online video games.
   v. The Complainant submits based on the Respondent's use of the FEROX brand and Games' assets to offer similar and competing goods and services, the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the FEROX brand at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Name. Actual knowledge of a complainant's rights in a mark prior to registering a confusingly similar domain name evinces bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.
   vi. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent disrupts the Complainant's business by diverting potential customers to the Website which offer similar and competing goods and services. Using a confusingly similar domain name in a manner disruptive of a Complainant's business by trading upon the goodwill of a Complainant for the commercial gain

evinces bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iii) and (v) of the Policy.

vii. In view of the distinctive nature of the FEROX mark, the colossal scope of the Complainant's business, and the substantial evidence of the Respondent targeting/impersonating the Complainant, the Complainant submits that there is no plausible reason why the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in question other than to target the Complainant and its FEROX mark.

viii. Based on the submissions above, the Complainant maintains that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and/or used in bad faith. Consequently, all elements of the Policy are satisfied.

Findings and Discussions

1- Since the Complainant provided detailed arguments and supporting documents to validate its claims regarding each article of the policy, the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent to put forward evidence that they do have rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. There is nothing in the record to show that the Complainant has licensed, authorized or permitted the Respondent to use that identity, the burden shifts to the Respondent to produce evidence that he possesses such rights or interests.

2- The Respondent failed to provide any evidence or supporting document to show his interest in the domain or rights to use it.

3- Intellectual rights of domain names are not limited by trademarks or service marks. They incorporate famous names related to entities known or connected to such terms including but not limited to company name, brand name registered marks and recognised names locally and internationally.

A) The Panel concludes that the Complainant established intellectual property rights in FEROX name for the purposes of Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Policy and the Domain Name is identical, confusingly similar to a trade mark, service mark or company identity name in which it has legitimate rights.

4- To establish the second element, the Respondent has failed to prove or even express his rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name as required in Clause 4(c) of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy. The complainant claims that there strong evidence that the Respondent is using the domain name to offer a Private Server copy of the Complainant games in an attempt to create an elusive connection with the Complainant and gain customer trust and financial benefits. Moreover, the Respondent has failed to prove that it has been commonly known by the domain name.

5- The Respondent is not using the Domain Name in connection with offering of distinguished or his/her "own" goods or services within the meaning of Article 5, paragraph 2, subparagraph 1 of the Policy. The Complainant has no prior business relationship with the Respondent whatsoever. At the time of filing, the Domain Name resolves to a "parked" page lacking any substantive content other than automatically generated ads.

6- The Respondent cannot credibly claim to be commonly known by the <FEROX> Domain Name, or a name corresponding to the Domain Name. According to the Whois record publicly available, the Respondent identifies himself as NJALLA/Hostmaster, which bears no resemblance to the Domain Name. In addition, the Domain Name is not being used in the promotion of any owned business or any other online service that might give rise to the Respondent being commonly known by the Domain Name.

7- The Respondent is not currently making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers within the meaning of article 5, paragraph 2, subparagraph 3 of the Policy.

8- The Respondent is currently using the domain name to point to a misleading online gaming. Such conduct cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent where the Respondent is seeking to unfairly capitalize on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's well-known name and reputations.

9- Despite PNINA's efforts to contact the Respondent, notifying the Respondent of the Complainant's claims to its rights in the FEROX domain name, the Respondent has not come forward in reply to the Complainant's demands or showed any interests in the Domain Name based on any legitimate non-commercial or fair use. He also declined to be engaged in the Dispute Resolution Process and never replied to the Panel's request to sign the Arbitration Form.

10- Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy states three ways in which the Respondent might meet this burden, but there is no strong indication on the record that it has succeeded along any of those lines. Clearly, neither the Respondent's name nor the names of his companies or business appearing on the domain name registration record show any connection to the word "FEROX" (Paragraph 4(c)(ii)). Moreover, there is nothing in the record to support a finding that the Respondent has used or prepared to use the disputed domain names in genuine offering of own services or goods (Paragraph 4(c)(i),) or is engaged in a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of this name (Paragraph 4(c)(iii)).

11- While the listings in Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy are not intended to be exhaustive of the ways of demonstrating rights and legitimate interests in domain names, the lack of a concrete evidence or any affiliation or real efforts by the Respondent in relation to the web site and its offerings fatally hampers the Panel in finding any other avenue by which the Respondent might prevail on this issue. There is no evidence that the Respondent is actually engaged in a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of this name.

B) The Panel concludes that the needed evidence to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name has been dully established, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 2 of the Policy.

12- Finally, the Complainant document and emails contend that the domain name was registered and is subsequently being used in bad faith. It contends that this is evident because the Respondent is being passively holding the domain name, and has registered the domain name (FEROX.PS) for the reason of offering online gaming service as if its affiliated with the Complainant .

13- The Policy states that the Evidence of Registration and Use in Bad Faith and for the purposes of Paragraph 4(a)(iii), the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: "(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant or any other party who is the owner of the trademark, service mark, well-known company identity or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or …"

14- The Complainant has submitted to the Panel substantiated statement, and a very strong tangible evidence (supporting documents and trademarks) that has not been denied or challenged by the Respondent, to support a finding that Respondent's actions fall under any of the four specific circumstances indicative of bad faith that are listed in Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

C) The Panel concludes that noting that the Policy only requires that a complainant demonstrate that the Domain Name was been registered or is being used in bad faith, it was proved without doubt that the Domain Name was both registered and is being used in bad faith.

Decision

1- **The Panel finds the disputed domain name <FEROX.PS> is identical to the Complainant's "FEROX" mark/identity known locally and worldwide.**
2- **The Panel also finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.**
3- **Finally, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.**

Therefore, in accordance with Paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and Paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <FEROX.PS> be transferred from the Respondent, NJALLA/HOSTMASTER From Charlestown, Saint Kitts And Nevis, to the Complainant, Jagex Limited, Cambridge, England, United Kingdom.

Dr. Marwan M. Radwan
[Signed]
Sole Panellist
Leicester, United Kingdom