

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Marq Vision Inc. v. SANDRA ODILE GUZMAN
Case No. D2026-1833

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Marq Vision Inc., United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is SANDRA ODILE GUZMAN, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <marqvisioninc.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 29, 2026. On April 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 1, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 4, 2026.

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 May 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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

The Complainant is a technology company founded in 2020 offering online brand protection and IP enforcement services. The Complainant is headquartered in Los Angeles, and has offices in San Francisco, New York, Seoul, Paris, Shanghai, and Tokyo. The Complainant works with companies such as Panasonic, Casetify, Henkel, Pril, and Stussy, and is the recipient of 2022 Innovation Award from LVMH in the category of Data and Artificial Intelligence Special Mention, and was named Spring 2025 G2 Leader in Brand Protection. The Complainant owns a trademark registration for the MARQVISION and Stylized M mark in the Republic of Korea (Trademark Registration Number 4017306270000, registered on May 11, 2022). The Complainant has been operating the domain name <marqvision.com>.

Based on the information from the Registrar, the Respondent is an individual with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 3, 2025, and does not resolve to any website with active content.

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 identical to the MARQVISION mark in which it has rights, with the addition of "inc" which is a generic identifier.

Next, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent is holding the disputed domain name for commercial gain.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Specifically, the Complainant contends that due to the distinctive nature of the MARQVISION trademark and the Complainant's fame, the Respondent must have known of the Complainant at the time of registration. The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name exactly replicates the Complainant's legal corporate name, and that this shows the Respondent's intent to exploit the Complainant's brand reputation and use the trademark in bad faith to deceive Internet users into believing that there was a relationship between the website and the Complainant. The Complainant also contends that bad faith can be inferred from the passive holding of the disputed domain name as the Complainant's mark is highly distinctive and there is no conceivable good faith use by the Respondent.

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 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 text portion of the Complainant's mark – "MARQVISION" – is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms here, "inc", 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 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.

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.

Moreover, prior UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Here, the disputed domain name consists of the exact text portion of the Complainant's mark together with the term "inc" which, as a whole, reflects the legal name of the Complainant, Marq Vision Inc. As such, the disputed domain name is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainant.

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, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and identical to the legal name of the Complainant. Based on the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's mark, as well as the distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark, it is likely for the Respondent to have targeted the Complainant in registering the disputed domain name in order to sell it to the Complainant at a profit, or to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark in some manner. It is highly improbable that the disputed domain name was registered in good faith and without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response to the Complaint, the Respondent's concealing its identity, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put, 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.

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 <marqvisioninc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: June 30, 2026