

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Jiffy Junk LLC v. Darryl Margau, SearchKings  
Case No. D2025-5323

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Jiffy Junk LLC, United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Darryl Margau, SearchKings, Canada.

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

The disputed domain name <jiffy-junk.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 18, 2025. On December 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 January 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 27, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on January 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of commencement of the panel appointment process on January 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on January 29, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers, or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a formal response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is a United States company operating in the junk collection and hauling field and owning the following trademark registration for JIFFY JUNK:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 5,427,629 JIFFY JUNK, registered on March 20, 2018;

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, "www.jiffyjunk.com" being its official website.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on September 30, 2024, and it resolves to a webpage with no other content than the Respondent's organization name and the advertisement of two partnerships, one with Microsoft Elite and the other with Google Premier.

#### **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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark JIFFY JUNK, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark, differing only by the insertion of a hyphen.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name, or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to divert Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has made no formal response to the Complainant's contentions. However, as noted above, on January 8, 2026, the Respondent sent the following informal email communication to the Center:

"Hi, Can I just release the domain, and he can go ahead and purchase it?"

Further, the Complainant provided copies of email exchanges with the Respondent following the filing of the Complaint, from which the Panel understands that the Respondent purchased the disputed domain name to "run a micro-site" for the Complainant's Google advertising campaigns, and it no longer needs it, as it is not running any such campaigns for the Complainant.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Complainant's trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition of a hyphen. 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.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".com", is typically ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it likely, noting the content of the Parties' email exchanges, that the Respondent knew the Complainant and deliberately registered the disputed domain name consisting of (and nearly identical to) the Complainant's trademark. The Panel also notes the Complainant's (undisputed) claim that the Respondent did so without the Complainant's authorization.

As regards the use of the disputed domain name, resolving to a webpage with no other content than the Respondent's organization name and the advertisement of two partnerships, one with Microsoft Elite and the other with Google Premier, 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 record, the Panel notes the nature of the disputed domain name (which consists of the Complainant's trademark, with the addition of just a hyphen), and the failure of the Respondent to submit a substantive 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.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the disputed domain name, nearly identical to the Complainant's own domain name (which remains true even though the "junk" element is disclaimed), coupled with the absence of rights or legitimate interests, on balance, supports the Panel's finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 <jiffy-junk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Edoardo Fano/*

**Edoardo Fano**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 4, 2026