

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Verizon Trademark Services LLC v. Qasim Arshad
Case No. D2025-0503

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Verizon Trademark Services LLC, United States of America ("US"), internally represented.

The Respondent is Qasim Arshad, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <verizonofficial.com> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 7, 2025. On February 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 11, 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 (John Doe) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 11, 2025, 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 February 11, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 4, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Rebecca Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on March 10, 2025. 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 company headquartered in Delaware, US. The Complainant is the intellectual property holding company for the Verizon group of companies, which includes Verizon Communications Inc. (collectively, "Verizon").

Verizon Communications Inc. was formed in 2000 and is one of the world's leading providers of technology and communications products and services. Verizon generated revenues of USD 134.8 billion in 2024. Verizon operates in over 150 countries.

The Complainant has a portfolio of registrations for the VERIZON trade mark including, US Trade Mark Registration No. 2,886,813 for VERIZON word mark (registered September 21, 2004) and US Trade Mark Registration No. 5,223,839 for VERIZON figurative mark (registered June 13, 2017) (the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <verizon.com>.

The Respondent is an individual apparently located in Pakistan. The Respondent did not submit a response, and consequently little information is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 28, 2024.

The disputed domain name has previously resolved to a website advertising Internet, home phone, and cable television services. The website under the disputed domain name displayed the Complainant's authorized dealer logo with the invitation "Call to Pay Your Bills Now" and a phone number. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an error page (displaying "Site not found").

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 confusingly similar to the Trade Mark. It consists of the entirety of the Trade Mark followed by the generic term "official".
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, there is no connection between the Respondent and the Complainant, and the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use the Trade Mark. The Respondent has made commercial use of the disputed domain name to offer services. In doing so, the Respondent took advantage of the Complainant's reputation. When active, the website at the disputed domain name featured a disclaimer which stated the website was not "an official website of any Telecommunications Service Provider, but is the Official Site of verizonofficial.com (Marketing Partner)". The Respondent is not, and never has been, a marketing partner of the Complainant.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent. The Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's rights in the Trade Mark when the Respondent

registered the disputed domain name. Such registration and use of a well-known trade mark is indicative of opportunistic bad faith. The Respondent has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. This is indicated by the display of the Complainant's "authorized dealer" logo on the website at the disputed domain name, with an invitation to "Call to Pay Your Bills Now" and a phone number. The Respondent's offer to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant is a further indicator of bad faith. The Respondent said that it would put the disputed domain name on the market for sale when the Complainant advised the Respondent of the legal position in relation to 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 the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

1. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
3. 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 trade mark 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 trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of other terms (here, "official") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade 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 that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Trade Mark and there is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, impersonation or passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

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 it highly unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and the Trade Mark, given the significant worldwide reputation of the Complainant and the composition of the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s goal in registering and using the disputed domain name appears to be to attract Internet users for taking unfair advantage of the Complainant’s well-known Trade Mark. This finding is reinforced by: (a) the Respondent’s historical use of the website at the disputed domain names to host a website that offers services similar to those offered by the Complainant and using the Complainant’s logo; and (b) the Respondent’s use of a disclaimer that creates the false impression of an affiliation with the Complainant (as a “marketing partner”). This amounts to “opportunistic bad faith” in violation of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, impersonation or passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <verizonofficial.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rebecca Slater/

Rebecca Slater

Sole Panelist

Date: March 13, 2025