

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rarestep, Inc. DBA Fleetio v. Jasper Farrow
Case No. D2025-0738

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rarestep, Inc. DBA Fleetio, United States of America ("US"), represented by Jackson Walker, LLP, US.

The Respondent is Jasper Farrow, US.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fleetio.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 21, 2025. On February 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 25, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 25, 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 28, 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 March 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Lynda J. Zadra-Symes as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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

Complainant is a technology company that specializes in vehicle fleet management software and solutions. Complainant launched its services under the FLEETIO mark in January 2012 and has used the mark continuously since that time.

Complainant owns several trademark registrations incorporating the mark FLEETIO for use in connection with its software products and services, including the following:

FLEETIO US Registration No. 5860104, registered September 17, 2019

FLEETIO & Design US Registration No. 7475143, registered August 13, 2024

FLEETIO GO US Registration No. 7499389, registered September 10, 2024

Complainant owns the domain name <fleetio.com>, where it advertises its services under the FLEETIO mark.

Respondent registered the disputed domain name through Spaceship, Inc. on February 4, 2025. The disputed domain name pointed to a file index page. Respondent hid his identity when registering the disputed domain name by using a privacy shield service.

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 an example of "typo-squatting" and is confusingly similar to Complainant's mark, that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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.

Although, the disputed domain name substitutes the letter “i” for the letter “l”, it is visually almost indistinguishable from Complainant’s mark. The Panel finds this “typo” difference 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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name only recently, on February 4, 2025. The Respondent therefore has not established rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that Respondent does not have any registered trademarks or trade names corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent been otherwise authorized to make any use of the Complainant’s mark in a domain name or otherwise. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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 disputed domain name is an example of “typo-squatting” that appears intended to impersonate the Complainant and confuse the public when attempting to type the Complainant’s valid domain name <fleetio.com>. The disputed domain name resolves to a page headed “Index of /” and containing a folder titled “cgi-bin”. Such registration and use of a domain name cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent and lead to an inference of bad faith. The record indicates that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to the Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

The Respondent also availed himself of a privacy shield service to protect his identity. The record indicates that the privacy shield is being used to help conceal Respondent's typosquatting activities.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name, and Respondent's use of a privacy shield to conceal his identity, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

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 <fieetio.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lynda J. Zadra-Symes/

Lynda J. Zadra-Symes

Sole Panelist

Date: April 14, 2025