

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LinkedIn Corporation v. Stacken Schneider  
Case No. D2025-1102

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is LinkedIn Corporation, United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

Respondent is Stacken Schneider, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <linkedinfiltration.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Lemon Shark Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 18, 2025. On March 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 18, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 13, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on April 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on April 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**

Complainant, founded in 2003, provides an online networking platform to connect professionals. Complainant's U.S. offices are located in various cities in the United States including New York and Sunnyvale and other international cities, including Beijing, Hong Kong, London, Singapore, Sydney, Tokyo, and Toronto, with over 1 billion members in more than 200 countries and regions. Complainant has 18,500 full-time employees with 38 offices in cities around the world and operates websites in 36 languages.

Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks, including:

- United States registered trademark number 3,074,241 for LINKEDIN word mark, registered March 28, 2006;
- United States registered trademark number 4,007,079 for LINKEDIN word mark, registered August 2, 2011; and
- European Union registered trademark number 4,183,893 for LINKEDIN word mark, registered July 24, 2006.

Complainant also owns numerous domain names, including <linkedin.com>, registered on November 2, 2002, and which Complainant operates in connection with its primary website.

The Domain Name was registered on May 17, 2024 and at the time of filing of the Complaint, redirected to a website with pornographic content, along with links to other adult websites. At the time of the Decision, the Domain Name redirected to an inactive or error page.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations for LINKEDIN and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known LINKEDIN products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes Complainant's trademarks, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

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

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”) states that failure to respond to the complainant’s contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent’s default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant’s claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence. See, e.g., *The Knot, Inc. v. In Knot We Trust LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0340](#).

### A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Complainant provided evidence of its rights in the LINKEDIN trademarks, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the LINKEDIN trademarks. With Complainant’s rights in the LINKEDIN trademark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in which it is registered (in this case, “.com”), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s LINKEDIN trademarks. The addition of the term “filtration” following Complainant’s trademark LINKEDIN, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the LINKEDIN trademark as it is recognizable in the Domain Name.

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

### B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its LINKEDIN trademarks, and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not authorized or licensed to use the LINKEDIN trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating the trademarks. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the LINKEDIN trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the evidence demonstrates that at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name redirected to a page featuring adult or pornographic content, which had no connection with the trademark LINKEDIN. At the time of the Decision, the Domain Name redirected to an inactive or error page. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and cannot under the circumstances confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. See, e.g., *Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A. v. Charles Duke / Oneandone Private Registration*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0875](#).

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a domain name registrant, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.”

The Panel finds that the available evidence on record shows that registration and use of the LINKEDIN trademarks predate the registration of the Domain Name. Indeed, Complainant's LINKEDIN trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized. Therefore, Respondent was likely aware of the LINKEDIN trademarks when he registered the Domain Name, or knew or should have known that the Domain Name was confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2; see also *TTT Moneycorp Limited v. Privacy Gods / Privacy Gods Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1973](#).

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Further, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Moreover, Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers looking for well-known LINKEDIN products and services of Complainant or authorized partners of Complainant. The use of the LINKEDIN trademarks in the Domain Name is intended to capture Internet traffic from Internet users who are looking for Complainant's products and services. The use of the Domain Name to divert users to the webpage with adult or pornographic content, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark is in bad faith. Furthermore, the content provided on the website the Domain Name reverted to, may result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation.

In addition, the record shows that at least five security vendors have reported that the Domain Name is associated with malicious, phishing or suspicious activities, according to a report from VirusTotal, a service that analyzes files and URLs for viruses, worms, trojans and other kinds of malicious content. The record also shows that Respondent has a history of being a serial cyber squatter, and previously registered numerous domain names that have been found by other panelists to be confusingly similar to well-known trademarks.

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a response to the Complaint, or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the implausibility of any good-faith use to which the Domain Name may be put.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith and Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <linkedinfiltration.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Kimberley Chen Nobles/*

**Kimberley Chen Nobles**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 8, 2025