

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal v. Domain  
Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD  
Case No. D2025-1670

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Cozen O'Connor, United States.

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD, Panama.

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

The disputed domain name <allieduniversalsecurity.com> is registered with Media Elite Holdings Limited (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 24, 2025. On April 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 26, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 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 April 28, 2025.

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 April 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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**

The Complainant is a company based in the United States, established in 1957, and providing proactive security services and cutting-edge technology to deliver evolving, tailored solutions, throughout the world in 90 countries.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks (the “ALLIED UNIVERSAL Trademarks”) including the following:

- the United States wordmark ALLIEDUNIVERSAL No. 5136006, registered on February 7, 2017, for products and services in classes 37, 41, 42 and 45;
- the United States combined trademark  No. 5136124, registered on February 7, 2017, for products and services in classes 37, 41, 42 and 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 16, 2018. At the date of the decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage including pay-per-click (“PPC”) links to third-party advertisers, including links related to security services or jobs, in connection with the Complainant’s field of activity.

#### **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 the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the ALLIED UNIVERSAL Trademarks, as it incorporates the Complainant’s trademark with the addition of the generic term “security” which will lead consumers to mistakenly believe that the disputed domain name is related to, affiliated with, or otherwise sponsored by the Complainant.

Then, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant explains that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and that there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to advance legitimate interests or for the bona fide offering of legitimate goods or services. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name reroutes to the Respondent’s competing website advertising, promoting, and offering for sale identical home security services to the Complainant’s home security services.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith by the Respondent. First, the Complainant states that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2018, long after the Complainant first began using and registered the ALLIED UNIVERSAL Trademarks. The Complainant considers that the Respondent chose to attach the term “security” at the end of the Complainant’s Trademarks in the disputed domain name and that it is likely that the Respondent plans to use the disputed domain name as a website or email extension to fraudulently obtain personal information from individuals believing that the disputed domain name is actually related to the Complainant. The Complainant also insists on the degree of distinctiveness and reputation of its ALLIED UNIVERSAL Trademarks.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 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, "security" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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.

Indeed, it appears that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not received any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the ALLIED UNIVERSAL Trademarks in the disputed domain name or in any other manner. Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading considering the addition of the term "security" to the Complainant's trademark, which refers to the Complainant's activities, thus creating a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 has registered the disputed domain name after the registration of the ALLIED UNIVERSAL Trademarks. The Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent had the ALLIED UNIVERSAL Trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain name, considering the addition of the term “security” to the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name, which refers to the Complainant’s activities. The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name resolves, at the time of the decision, to PPC links to third-party advertisers, including links related to security services or jobs.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation, in a likely attempt of taking unfair advantage of the reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks, and constitutes bad faith under the Policy

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <allieduniversalsecurity.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/*

**Christiane Féral-Schuhl**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 5, 2025