

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

G4S Limited v. spangy lee, websiter  
Case No. D2025-5280

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is G4S Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

Respondent is spangy lee, websiter, Ghana.

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

The disputed domain name <g4slogistics.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 17, 2025. On December 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 18, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 18, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 18, 2025. Respondent sent an email to the Center on December 18, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 11, 2026. Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on January 20, 2026. 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 Kingdom. For over a decade prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered global shipping, security, and logistics services under its mark G4S. In this regard, Complainant owns several registrations for the G4S mark. These include, among others, International Registration No. 885912 (registered October 11, 2005); European Union Registration No. 015263064 (registered September 20, 2010); and United States of America Registration No. 3378800 (registered February 5, 2008).

The disputed domain name was registered on September 28, 2025. Respondent has set up a website at the URL associated with the disputed domain name that purports to offer services that compete with those offered by Complainant, and including references to Complainant's registered G4S mark.

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

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

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is 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 G4S mark for shipping, security, and logistics services, operating in around 90 countries. Complainant contends that it has more than 800,000 employees globally including in South Africa, where Respondent advertises competing services via the disputed domain name. Complainant contends that Respondent has deliberately included Complainant's G4S mark in the disputed domain name, with the addition only of the term "logistics," a service offered to consumers by Complainant under Complainant's own domain name <g4s.com> (registered December 1, 1999).

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, having simply acquired the disputed domain name for Respondent's own commercial gain.

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

Respondent did not formally reply to Complainant's contentions. However, Respondent sent an email to the Center on December 18, 2025, stating that the disputed domain name, which begins with "G4S" and ends with "logistics," stands for "Gold (4) for Sampson Logistics", and was not intended to copy or use Complainant's brand name. Respondent asserted that the disputed domain name has a different meaning and purpose than Complainant's, and requested that their website be allowed to operate without issue.

#### **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 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 trademark G4S, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Although the addition of other terms (here, “logistics”) 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 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 notes that the website associated with the disputed domain name purports to offer products or services that relate to, and compete with, those offered by Complainant via Complainant’s G4S marks. Complainant has not authorized any activities by Respondent, nor any use of its trademarks thereby. Prior UDRP panels have indicated that a reseller, distributors, or service provider may be considered to have rights or legitimate interests in a mark, provided certain requirements are met. These generally include that: (i) the site is actually offering the goods or services at issue; (ii) the site is used only to sell the trademarked goods or services; (iii) the site accurately and prominently discloses the registrant’s relationship to the mark holder; and (iv) respondent does not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8; see also *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903.

The Panel finds that these qualifications are not fulfilled by the website associated with the disputed domain name. Rather, the website associated with the disputed domain name does not appear to include a disclaimer of affiliation or endorsement by Complainant, and rather includes unauthorized use of Complainant’s marks. Respondent has not put forward any evidence that would suggest rights or legitimate interests for the purposes of the Policy. Respondent contends that the disputed domain name stands for “Gold (4) for Sampson Logistics.” However, nothing in the record shows that Respondent has been commonly known by “Gold (4) for Sampson Logistics,” nor has Respondent used “Gold (4) for Sampson Logistics” in connection with its services. On the contrary, it appears that Respondent uses “G4S Logistics” throughout its website, which indicates Respondent’s intent to trade off Complainant’s reputation.

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, and accordingly the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **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, Respondent has set up a website at the URL associated with the disputed domain name that purports to offer global shipping, security, and logistics services that compete with those offered by Complainant, and including references to Complainant's registered G4S mark. Hence, Respondent was presumably aware of Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name and is trading on the goodwill of Complainant's trademarks to attract Internet users for Respondent's own commercial gain. The Panel concludes that the registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <g4slogistics.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Lorelei Ritchie/*

**Lorelei Ritchie**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 3, 2026