

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Loomis AB v. Almazs Robinson

Case No. D2025-0526

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Loomis AB, Sweden, represented by ZeroFox, United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Almazs Robinson, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <loomisarmoredservices.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 10, 2025. On February 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On February 11, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy, PrivacyGuardian.org llc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 12, 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 amendment to the Complaint on February 19, 2025.

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 February 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2025. The Center received a communication from a third party on February 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. On March 19, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment.

The Center appointed Gregor Vos as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 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 cash handling company and was founded in 1997. It is headquartered in Sweden and offers its services throughout Europe and North America. It is most known for its armored transport vehicles.

The Complainant is the owner of inter alia the following trademark registration (hereinafter referred to as: the "Trademark"):

- United States trademark registration No. 3415090 for LOOMIS (combined) registered on April 22, 2008.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <loomis.com>, which has been registered since 1995.

The Domain Name was registered on February 1, 2024. Currently, the Domain Name does not resolve to an active website.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the Trademark of the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, and the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Firstly, according to the Complainant, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its Trademark. The Domain Name incorporates the Trademark in its entirety, with the mere addition of "armoredservices", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trademark is reinforced by the fact that the Complainant is most known for their armored transport vehicles.

Secondly, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has never received a license or any other form of authorization from the Complainant to use the Trademark or to imply any connection with the Complainant. Also, the Domain Name has neither been used nor prepared for use for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, according to the Complainant, the Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. The Respondent is intentionally attempting to leverage the Trademark, given its reputation and recognition, to associate the Domain Name with the Complainant for commercial gain. Also, the presence of an active mail exchange ("MX") record suggests that the Respondent intends to send and receive emails from this Domain Name, increasing the likelihood that such correspondence would be mistakenly attributed to the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent has concealed its identity using a privacy service.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, on February 25, 2025, the Center received an email communication from a third party claiming to be located at the address provided by the Respondent in the registration details for the Domain Name. The third party asserts that it is not affiliated in

any way with the named Respondent in these proceedings. Since the Center has not received any reply from the named Respondent, the Panel finds that the Respondent is in default.

6. Discussion and Findings

For the Complainant to succeed, it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

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

Only if all three elements have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedy requested by the Complainant. The Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

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 textual element of the Trademark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.10.

Although the addition of other terms, here "armoredservices", which will be understood as two terms, namely "armored" and "services", 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 Domain Name and the Trademark 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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's rights to the Trademark predate the registration date of the Domain Name. Given the fact that the Respondent added "armored" and "services" to the Complainant's Trademark in the Domain Name, which is descriptive of the Complainant's services, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that it is not conceivable that the Respondent chose the Domain Name without knowledge of the Complainant's activities and its Trademark.

This further suggests, in the Panel's view and in the circumstances of this case, that the Respondent has intentionally sought to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion with the Trademark among Internet users.

Further, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a page that does not resolve to an active webpage) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the composition of the Domain Name and the fact that the Respondent seemingly used false contact details to register the Domain Name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the 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 Domain Name <loomisarmoredservices.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gregor Vos/

Gregor Vos

Sole Panelist

Date: April 7, 2025