

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Equifax Inc. v. no reply, equifax
Case No. D2025-3751

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Equifax Inc., United States of America (the “US”), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, US.

The Respondent is no reply, equifax, Australia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <equifaxadmin.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 16, 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 17, 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 (Undisclosed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 18, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 18, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Monica Novac as the sole panelist in this matter on October 21, 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 US company established in 1913. The Complainant is a global data, analytics and technology company providing information solutions for businesses, governments and consumers, as well as human resources business process automation and outsourcing services for employers. The Complainant operates in numerous countries around the globe, including Australia, where the Respondent is reportedly located.

The Complainant states that in 2024, its operating revenue was USD 5,681.1 million, while its operating income was USD 1,042.1 million. As of December 31, 2024, the Complainant employed approximately 14,700 employees in 22 countries.

The Complainant claims that it owns at least 221 trademark registrations for EQUIFAX in at least 56 jurisdictions around the world, including the following:

- US Trademark Registration No. 1,027,544 EQUIFAX (word), registered on December 16, 1975, for services in class 36;
- US Trademark Registration No. 1,045,574 EQUIFAX (word), registered on August 3, 1976, for services in class 35;
- US Trademark Registration No. 1,644,585 EQUIFAX (word), registered on May 14, 1991, for services in classes 35, 36 and 42;
- Australia Trademark Registration No. 760084 EQUIFAX (word), registered on January 29, 1999, for services in classes 35, 36, 38 and 42; and
- Australia Trademark Registration No. 1768126 EQUIFAX (word), registered on January 9, 2018, for services in classes 35, 36, 41, 42 and 45.

The EQUIFAX trademark was first used in commerce in 1975.

Previous UDRP panels have already recognized the well-known character of the EQUIFAX trademarks.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <equifax.com>, registered on February 21, 1995, which is used in connection with the Complainant's primary website.

The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on November 17, 2023. As of the date of filing of the Complaint and this Decision, when accessed by the Panel, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive website.

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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's EQUIFAX trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and it is being used in bad faith.

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 EQUIFAX trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel finds that the EQUIFAX trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Disputed Domain Name also contains the term "admin", however the Panel finds that the addition of this element does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the Disputed Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Further to all the above, 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.

It is accepted by the Panel that the Complainant has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the registration or use of its EQUIFAX trademark by the Respondent. There is also no evidence that the Respondent holds any rights over EQUIFAX.

The Panel is of the opinion that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or by “equifax”, despite the fact that the Respondent’s organization name, as disclosed by the Registrar, is “equifax”. Rather, the Panel considers most likely that the Respondent used the name “equifax” as part of its registration details to falsely create an association between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant.

As noted above, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive webpage. The Respondent has not brought any evidence that it has engaged in any demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as per the Policy. In view of the composition of the Disputed Domain Name and the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the Panel is of the opinion that the Disputed Domain Name is likely to mislead Internet users, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name.

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.

Further to all the above, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant registered and used its EQUIFAX trademark long before the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name. In view of the Complainant’s global presence, the recognition and well-known character of its trademark and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant’s trademark and business when registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark to create a false association or affiliation with the Complainant and it is a clear proof of the Respondent’s bad faith.

Another proof in support of the Respondent's bad faith registration of the Disputed Domain Name is represented by the registrant details provided by the Respondent when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In this sense, the Respondent indicated the Complainant's trademark and company name as the name of registrant organization. Noting its findings under the second element above, the Panel infers that when registering the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant.

Regarding the lack of active use of the Disputed Domain Name, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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 and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent's concealing its identity and use of a false name listing the Complainant's mark as a registrant organization, as well as the Respondent's failure to submit a response, 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.

Further to all the above, 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 <equifaxadmin.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Monica Novac/

Monica Novac

Sole Panelist

Date: November 4, 2025