

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal v. Randy Queen
Case No. D2024-4629

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Cozen O’Connor, United States.

The Respondent is Randy Queen, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alliedbartonhr.org> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 11, 2024. On November 12, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 12, 2024, 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 November 12, 2024, 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 November 13, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint [together with the amendment to the Complaint/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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 15, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 5, 2024. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 3, 2024. However, the Respondent did not submit any formal response. On December 10, 2025, the Complainant sent an email to the Respondent stating that it would suspend the proceedings if the Respondent is willing to transfer the domain name to it. The record does not

reflect the Respondent's reply. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on December 17, 2024.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on December 24, 2024. 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 security services provider established in the United States in 1957, and now providing services internationally. It is the proprietor of numerous registrations for its marks, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3144421 for ALLIEDBARTON (word mark), registered on September 19, 2006 for services in class 45;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3152959 for ALLIEDBARTON SECURITY SERVICES (word mark), registered on October 10, 2006 for services in class 45;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3144420 for



(device mark), registered on September 19, 2006 for services in class 45;

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3223891 for (device mark),



registered on April 3, 2007 for services in class 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 25, 2024. At the time of the Complaint and of this Decision, it resolved to a page featuring pay-per-click ("PPC") links related to security services and including a link entitled "AlliedBarton Security 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it is the world's largest security services company. The Complainant is valued at USD 18 billion, and operates in at least 90 countries with approximately 800,000 employees globally. The Complainant claims to be the third largest employer in North America and the seventh largest employer in the world. The disputed domain name reflects the Complainant's mark with the addition of the term "hr", which refers to "Human Resources" and does not distinguish it. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has no right to use its mark. The disputed domain name, which was registered long after the Complainant established rights in its marks, is not being used for a website. It has been registered to trade off the Complainant's goodwill in the ALLIEDBARTON mark to confuse consumers. The addition of the term "hr" indicates that the Respondent intends to use the disputed domain name to deceive Internet users for fraudulent purposes by implying that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant's human resources department.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent provided an email response stating the following: “I randy queen was testing out how to create a business email. I didn't realize i created the email address as alliedbarton. This email was created in error and hasn't been used, this email can address can be deleted. Sorry for the confusion.”

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (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 Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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 ALLIEDBARTON mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “hr”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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 3.0](#), 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 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.

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.

The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which consists of the Complainant's ALLIEDBARTON mark adding "hr", which is a common abbreviation for "human resources". Therefore, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that there are any circumstances or activities that would establish the Respondent's rights therein. Rather, the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring PPC links related to the Complainant's business and reflecting its mark. Under these circumstances, such use does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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 has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The disputed domain name reflects the Complainant's ALLIEDBARTON mark together with the descriptive term "hr", implying an association with the Complainant and its human resources department. The disputed domain name was registered several years after the Complainant registered its ALLIEDBARTON mark. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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.

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website featuring PPC links related to the Complainant's business, and reflecting the Complainant's ALLIEDBARTON mark, is an indication of bad faith use of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5.

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 <alliedbartonhr.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: January 2, 2025