

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal v. Mike Powells  
Case No. D2025-3743

### 1. The Parties

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.

Respondent is Mike Powells, United States.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <allieduniversalfin.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 September 15, 2025. On September 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 16, 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 Complainant on September 24, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 26, 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 September 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 20, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 22, 2025. The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on November 4, 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**

Complainant is a multinational company based in the United States. For a number of years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered security and other services under the marks ALLIED UNIVERSAL and ALLIED UNIVERSAL SECURITY SERVICES. Complainant is the owner of several registrations for its ALLIED UNIVERSAL mark. These include, among others, United States Registration No. 5,136,006 (registered on February 7, 2017).

The disputed domain name was registered on November 19, 2024. Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to redirect users to a website that masquerades as an official website of Complainant, including use of Complainant's ALLIED UNIVERSAL marks, offering delivery services, and inviting web users to click on a link to "Contact Us."

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

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

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the ALLIED UNIVERSAL mark for which it has gained global notoriety as the "world's largest security services company," with approximately 800,000 employees in over 90 countries. Complainant contends that prior UDRP panels have recognized its rights. Complainant further contends that Respondent has incorporated in full Complainant's ALLIED UNIVERSAL mark into the disputed domain name, with only the addition of the term "fin," which does not avoid confusion. Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and rather has registered and is using it in a "fraudulent" and bad faith manner to create a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Complainant claims the "professional team" on the website is made up of fake people and it is not actually offering courier services.

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

Respondent did not reply to 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. Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, ALLIED UNIVERSAL, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Although the addition of other terms (here, the term "fin") 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 Complainant's mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

## **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. Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name is being used to redirect users to an unauthorized website that creates a likelihood of confusion with Complainant, offering delivery services, and which invites online users to click links to “Contact Us.” Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including fraudulent use, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

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

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s decision, the record includes evidence that the URL associated with the disputed domain name has been used to redirect users to an unauthorized website that creates a likelihood of confusion with Complainant, offering delivery services, and which invite online users to click links to “Contact Us.”

Hence, Respondent is trading on the goodwill of Complainant’s trademarks to attract Internet users, presumably for Respondent’s own commercial gain.

Therefore, the Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of 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 <allieduniversalfin.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Lorelei Ritchie/  
Lorelei Ritchie  
Sole Panelist  
Date: November 18, 2025*