

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Insight Global, LLC v. Zahid Khan
Case No. D2026-0851

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Insight Global, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Troutman Pepper Locke, United States.

The Respondent is Zahid Khan, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <insightsglobalventure.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 26, 2026. On February 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 2, 2026, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 2, 2026, 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 March 2, 2026, and an amendment to the Complaint on March 6, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and 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 March 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 27, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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 issued Administrative Procedural Order No. 1 (the "Procedural Order") on April 20, 2026 to provide the Complainant an opportunity to further elaborate on and explain the evidence in the Complaint. The Complainant responded to the Procedural Order on April 24, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Delaware corporation based in Atlanta, Georgia that provides international staffing services. The Complainant was founded in 2001 and has grown to have over 60 offices around the world. The Complainant was named one of the three largest information technology staffing firms in America and completes more than 41,000 placements annually.

The Complainant operates its website at the domain name <insightglobal.com>.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in the United States including for INSIGHTGLOBAL (as one word) and a stylized crescent device which is United States Registration No. 4,997,327 that was registered on July 12, 2016. This registration is in class 35 for employment hiring, recruiting, placement and staffing services. This mark is not currently being used on the Complainant's website at "www.insightglobal.com".

The Complainant also owns a United States trademark registration for INSIGHT GLOBAL A STAFFING SERVICES COMPANY & Design (Registration No. 3,630,697) which issued to registration on June 2, 2009, and which disclaimed the words "global" and "a staffing services company".

The Complainant also owns trademark registrations in other jurisdictions, such as Canada, the United Kingdom, the European Union, and India.

The Respondent did not file a Response, so little information is known about the Respondent. According to the Registrar's records, the Respondent has an address in United Arab Emirates.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 2, 2026.

The website at the disputed domain name has "Insights Global Ventures Educational Services" as its heading. The website has a logo that includes the words "Insights Global Venture" which is different to the Complainant's current logo on the Complainant's website and which is different to the Complainant's logos in the Complainant's trademark registrations. The website includes the following as the first textual paragraph: "Insights Global Ventures Educational Services is a diversified business group dedicated to providing top-tier recruitment solutions and secure financial services. Our mission is simple: help organizations succeed by connecting them with the right people and offering reliable, compliant financial solutions."

The website at the disputed domain name includes an address in Dubai, a telephone number, and email contact details. The name of the operator of the website (for example, in the Terms & Conditions dated February 3, 2026 and in the copyright notice) is "Insights Global Ventures Educational Services".

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.

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions:

The Complainant has adopted and uses the mark INSIGHT GLOBAL and owns INSIGHT GLOBAL registrations in the United States. The Respondent registered a nearly identical, lookalike domain name after the Complainant's trademark registrations were a matter of public record.

The Complainant's three United States trademark registrations create a deep repository of rights in the Complainant's INSIGHT GLOBAL marks. They put the entire world, including the Respondent, on constructive notice of the Complainant's trademarks.

The Complainant has a network of more than 60 office locations across over 35 United States states, the District of Columbia, Canada, United Kingdom, India, and Philippines. The Complainant was named one of the three largest Information Technology staffing firms in America by Staffing Industry Analysts for many years, including in 2025. Publications have labelled the Complainant as a "staffing giant" and a "multinational staffing company". The Complainant is well known within and beyond the staffing industry.

There is no coincidence that the nearly identical disputed domain name was improperly and maliciously registered.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks in that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety, simply inserting a single letter "s" after the word "insight", and appending the generic, non-distinctive word "venture." The only reason for such mimicry is the sole and deliberate intention to cause confusion.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name more than 24 years after the Complainant registered and commenced use of its mark.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, and to the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent owns no United States or international trademark applications or registrations corresponding to the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's services are directly competitive with the Complainant. Adopting a name that mimics a competitor's famous mark to offer competing services is not a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy.

UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

The Respondent had constructive notice of the Complainant's United States trademark registrations.

Given that the Respondent registered a domain name to promote services directly identical to the Complainant's — staffing, talent acquisition, and professional recruitment — it strains credulity to suggest that the Respondent was unaware of INSIGHT GLOBAL, one of the largest and most widely recognized IT staffing companies in the United States. The Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant's mark at the time of registration may be inferred from these facts.

The disputed domain name constitutes typosquatting.

The uniqueness of the Complainant's mark supports an inference of bad faith.

The timing of the registration of the disputed domain name, decades after the Complainant first used its mark, suggests actual knowledge of the Complainant's mark.

There is no plausible good faith explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (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.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant's trademark is INSIGHTGLOBAL. The disputed domain name is not identical, because it uses the word "insights" not "insight" and includes the additional word "venture". The Complainant's trademark registrations also include design elements, such as a stylized crescent device. To the extent that design elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, an "s" after "insight" and the word "venture") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and submits that “adopting a name that mimics a competitor’s famous mark to offer competing services is not a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy.”

Even though the Respondent did not file a Response or provide any evidence to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Panel has considered whether paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy applies in the present case, that is, whether the Respondent has demonstrated that before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent has shown use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant’s evidence to support this includes that the Respondent has no verifiable registration on the United Arab Emirates Business Register and the Respondent does not have a trade license under issued by the United Arab Emirates Department of Economic Development or a relevant free trade authority. Additionally, the Respondent’s website purports to offer a range of services, such as staffing services, cheque discounting, and gold trading, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has necessary financial licenses to offer such services. Further, the Respondent’s website makes claims of having “years of experience” and a “proven track record” when it appears that the Respondent established the website in 2026 and there is no other evidence of the Respondent’s business other than the website (such as a LinkedIn company page, Google business listings, customer reviews, press releases, news articles or job postings). The Respondent’s website does not include details of any named employee, founder, owner, or director, and a name in an email address on the website appears to be a full-time accountant with a different entity who has no reference to the Respondent in his LinkedIn biography.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent’s website at the disputed domain name sometimes uses the name “Insights Global Venture” (which matched the disputed domain name) and in other places “Insights Global Ventures Educational Services” which has a plural version of “venture”.

Based upon the foregoing, and other information provided by the Complainant, the Panel concludes that the Respondent’s website at the disputed domain name does not show use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent had actual or constructive knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant provided evidence of its international operations and reputation, but no evidence of operations of any reputation particular to United Arab Emirates where the Respondent is located. However, the Complainant provided evidence of its size, global reach and global operations, including an office in the United Kingdom that services the United Arab Emirates, and in India which has a close geographic and economic relationship with the United Arab Emirates particularly in respect of recruitment services.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is a nearly identical, lookalike domain name when compared to the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant submits that there is no plausible good faith explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel agrees.

The Panel considers that it is more than a coincidence that the Respondent uses "Insight" and "Global" in combination in the same way as the Complainant to promote similar services to the Complainant. The combination "INSIGHTGLOBAL" used by the Complainant is not a usual combination (i.e., the more natural order would be "global insight").

The Panel concludes that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name knowing of and because of the Complainant and its reputation.

In respect of bad faith use, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent's website is not legitimate, as discussed above in respect of the second element of the Policy. The Complainant also states that the Respondent's website creates a risk of harm to job seekers and employers because the website offers regulated financial services without evident licensing, and trades off the Complainant's name to do so. Based on the evidence provided, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source or affiliation of the Respondent's website.

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 <insightsglobalventure.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2026