

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Insight Global, LLC v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC

Case No. D2025-0549

1. The Parties

1.1 The Complainant is Insight Global, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Troutman Pepper Locke, United States of America (the “Complainant”).

1.2 The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis (the “Respondent”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

2.1 The disputed domain name <insightglobalrecruit.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 11, 2025. On February 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On February 12, 2025, 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 (“REDACTED FOR PRIVACY”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 13, 2025, 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 February 13, 2025.

3.2 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”).

3.3 In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 21, 2025.

3.4 The Center appointed Ike Ehiribe as the sole panelist in this matter on March 28, 2025. 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

4.1 The Complainant Insight Global LLC is a limited liability company under the laws of Delaware, United States which provides services as an international staffing and services company, that specializes in sourcing information technology, government, accounting, finance and engineering professionals and delivering solutions to Fortune 1000 clients. The Complainant company was founded as an entrepreneurial start-up in 2001. The Complainant has grown exponentially and now completes more than 41,000 placements annually in short-term, long-term, contract to hire and direct placement positions in more than 70 office locations across the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, India and the Philippines. Furthermore, the Complainant is known as a leader in staffing, jobs and careers and is regularly cited by national publications where the Complainant is described as a “staffing giant” and or a “multinational staffing company”. The Complainant is the owner of rights in the mark, including: INSIGHT GLOBAL A STAFFING SERVICES COMPANY, trademark number 3,630,697, registered in the United States on June 2, 2009; INSIGHT GLOBAL, trademark number 4,997,327, registered in the United States on July 12, 2016; and numerous other trademark registrations (collectively referred to as the “mark”) as contained in Annex 9 attached to the Complaint.

4.2 The Respondent is known as Njalla Okta LLC an organization based in Charlestown in Saint Kitts and Nevis. According to the attached Whois record, the Respondent created the Disputed Domain Name <insightglobalrecruit.com> on January 16, 2025 and registered same with Tucows Inc. the Registrar.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

5.1 The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

5.2 Notably, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's INSIGHT GLOBAL trademark in its entirety. The only difference being the mere addition of the generic word “recruit”. It is further submitted that the word “recruit” is inherently linked to the services rendered by the Complainant and therefore reinforces the possibility of confusion in the minds of Internet visitors and a suggestion that the Disputed Domain Name is somehow affiliated to the Complainant or its trademark or that the Disputed Domain Name is associated with the Complainant offering further recruiting services options. See *KPMG International Co-operative v. Domain Administrator*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2274](#), where the panel held that the addition of the word recruits does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

5.3 The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name as the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Respondent been authorized to use the Complainant's trademark for any purpose. In addition, it is submitted that, to the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent does not own any United States or international trademark applications or registrations for the INSIGHT GLOBAL trademark. In addition, it is asserted that the Respondent is not commonly known as INSIGHT GLOBAL and has therefore failed to establish any rights or interests in the Disputed Domain Name within the ambit of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy. The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent without any authorization from the Complainant has used the Disputed Domain Name to falsely display a picture of one of the Complainant's employees and the Complainant's logo.

5.4 With regards to bad faith registration and use, the Complainant alludes to a number of factors that demonstrate that the Respondent must have registered and has continued to use the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. In the first instance it is asserted that the very nature of the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name evidences bad faith, following *KPMG International Co-operative v. Domain Administrator, supra*. It is submitted that the Respondent knowingly registered the Disputed Domain Name which is a near-exact reproduction of the Complainant's unique trademark more so, as a simple trademark search would have revealed the existence of the Complainant's trademark and its reputation. It is also submitted that the Complainant's trademark is so distinctive and therefore it is most unlikely that the Respondent chose the phrase "INSIGHT GLOBAL" on its own. Finally, it is argued that since the Respondent has actually misappropriated the Complainant's logo and the identity of one of the Complainant's employees in a fraudulent attempt to contact potential customers by engaging in phishing activity, the Respondent's conduct in this regard is further evidence of bad faith use.

B. Respondent

5.5 The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and therefore, the Panel shall draw such adverse inferences from the Respondent's failure to respond as may be deemed appropriate.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

6.1 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.

6.2 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.

6.3 The entirety of the 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.

6.4 Although the addition of other terms such as the word "recruits" and the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

6.5 The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has not been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

6.6 Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

6.7 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.

6.8 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.

6.9 Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing, 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.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

6.11 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.

6.12 In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on January 16, 2025, well after the registration by the Complainant of its well-known trademark INSIGHTGLOBAL in multiple jurisdictions, therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent deliberately embarked on a scheme to exploit the Complainant's reputation in the international staffing and services business worldwide.

6.13 Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

6.14 Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing, 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 the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. The Complainant's evidence indicates that the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name to falsely display a picture of the Complainant's employees and the Complainant's logo

6.15 The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

7.1 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 <insightglobalrecruit.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ike Ehiribe/

Ike Ehiribe

Sole Panelist

Date: April 18, 2025