

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Solera Holdings, LLC v. PrivacyGuardian.org LLC

Case No. D2024-1049

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Solera Holdings, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Pranger Law PC, United States.

The Respondent is PrivacyGuardian.org LLC, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <soleracareers.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 March 10, 2024. On March 11, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 11, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (PrivacyGuardian.org LLC)<sup>1</sup> and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 13, 2024, 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 March 18, 2024.

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 March 20, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 9, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent’s default on April 11, 2024.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Panel notes that in reply to the Center’s request for verification the Registrar indicated that “the user provided fake contact information” and provided only a phone number and an email address (the latter being used for the purposes of the notification of the Complaint).

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on April 26, 2024. 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 is a company incorporated in Delaware, United States, providing software and services related to vehicle insurance claims, repairs, spare parts inventory and fleet management.

The Complainant is the proprietor of several trademark registrations, including United States Trademark Registration No. 5050145 for SOLERA (word mark), registered on September 27, 2016, for services in class 36. It operates its primary business website at the domain name "solera.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on November 8, 2023. At the time of this Decision, it resolved to a website featuring pay-per-click ("PPC") links. The record reflects that it was previously used by the Respondent to generate e-mail messages to one or more job seekers of the Complainant.

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

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

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that, on the day following the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent began sending e-mail messages impersonating an employee of the Complainant to a job seeker of the Complainant in furtherance of a fraudulent scheme. In these messages, the Respondent purported to offer employment to the recipient, sent a falsified employment contract and a check in purported payment of expenses, requesting funds to be wired back to the Respondent. The Complainant is aware of other instances of the same fraudulent use of the disputed domain name. Finally, the Registrar has confirmed that the Respondent provided fake contact information.

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

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

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

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

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

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

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

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's SOLERA mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "careers") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

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

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes there is no evidence that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Rather, the record contains evidence that the Respondent attempted to impersonate the Complainant's employees by sending e-mail messages to a prospective employee with the objective of defrauding the recipient. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Complainant's SOLERA mark was registered several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name reflects that mark in its entirety, together with the terms "careers," which is intended to create the impression that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant's recruitment. On this record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has provided evidence that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to generate fraudulent email to the Complainant's prospective employee in an attempt to obtain payment from him or her. The Respondent has not attempted to provide a good-faith explanation for such conduct and the Panel does not find it credible that one could exist.

On this record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element 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 <soleracareers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/*

**Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 10, 2024