

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

CK Franchising, Inc. v. Saim Blower  
Case No. D2023-3062

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is CK Franchising, Inc., United States of America (“United States”) represented by Areopage, France.

The Respondent is Saim Blower, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <comfortskeeper.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 18, 2023. On July 18, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 18, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (PrivacyGuardian.org llc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 20, 2023, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 21, 2023.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 21, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 11, 2023.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on August 16, 2023. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant provides in-home medical care services. The Complainant was founded in 1998. The Complainant provides in-home care services to thousands of persons every day in thirteen countries through seven hundred offices.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations around the world for the trademark COMFORT KEEPERS (the "Mark"), the earliest of which is United States Patent and Trademark Office, Registration Number 2366096, dated December 7, 1999.

The Complainant's principal domain name is <comfortkeepers.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 3, 2023. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking website providing links that redirect Internet users to third party websites in competition with the Complainant.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant asserts the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark because the disputed domain name is composed by omitting the space between the two words composing the Mark, adding the letter "s" to the Mark's first word, and removing the letter "s" from the Mark's second word.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name considering that Complainant never authorized the Respondent to use the disputed domain name, as well as that the Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name, never operated a business under the disputed domain name, has not advertised the disputed domain name, and never engaged in any *bona fide* commercial activity in connection with the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also asserts that Mark is purely fanciful and that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Mark with reasonable investigation and registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Mark.

The disputed domain name is composed by omitting the space between the two words composing the Mark, adding as “s” to the Mark’s first word, and removing the letter “s” from the Mark’s second word. The disputed domain name thus consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of the Mark. Panels have found that such misspellings create confusingly similarity for purposes of the first element.” See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.9.

The generic Top-Level Domain of the disputed domain names, in this case “.com”, may be disregarded for the purposes of assessment under the first element, as it is viewed as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. *Monster Energy Company, a Delaware Corporation v. J.H.M. den Ouden*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1759](#).

The Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Panel finds on the evidence presented that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has specifically disavowed providing the Respondent with permission to use the disputed domain name or the Mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has conducted any *bona fide* business under the disputed domain name or is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant has established a *prima facie* case in its favor, which shifts the burden of production on this point to the Respondent. The Respondent, however, has failed to come forth with any evidence showing any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name will likely confuse unsuspecting Internet users into believing the disputed domain name would resolve websites associated, sponsored, or affiliated with the Complainant.

The facts and circumstances presented to the Panel demonstrate that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, bad faith may be established by any one of the following non-exhaustive scenarios:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, 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 location or of a product or service on the respondent’s website or location.

The Panel finds on the evidence presented that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

A simple Internet search, which should normally be undertaken before registering a domain name, would have quickly disclosed the Mark and Complainant's activities under such. Moreover, the Mark is internationally well-known in connection home care services, including in the United States where the Respondent is located. It strains credulity to believe that the Respondent innocently and unknowingly registered and used the disputed domain name composed of superficial, and obvious, spelling mistake of the Mark, especially when the disputed domain name resolves to a parking website offering links to services competitive with the Complainant's services.

Finally, even ignoring the above compelling evidence of bad faith registration and use, it is difficult to conceive of any use that the Respondent might make of the disputed domain name without the Complainant's consent that would not involve bad faith. *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#); *Verner Panton Design v. Fontana di Luce Corp*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1909](#) (where the reputation of a complainant in a given mark is significant and the mark bears strong similarities to the disputed domain name, the likelihood of confusion is such that bad faith may be inferred).

The Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

## 7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <comfortskeeper.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/William F. Hamilton/*

**William F. Hamilton**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2026