

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Verisure Sàrl v. web master, Expired domain caught by auction winner.***Maybe for sale on Dynadot Marketplace***
Case No. D2025-1126

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Verisure Sàrl, Switzerland, represented by Abion GmbH, Switzerland.

The Respondent is web master, Expired domain caught by auction winner.***Maybe for sale on Dynadot Marketplace***, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <verisurerapidresponse.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 19, 2025. On March 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 21, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 21, 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 March 24, 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 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Richard C.K. van Oerle as the sole panelist in this matter on April 17, 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 incorporated in Switzerland and a leading global provider, since 1988, of professionally monitored security systems, under the trademark VERISURE (the "Trademark"). The Complainant is the owner of numerous registrations for the Trademark, including European Union registration No. 006674915, with a registration date of March 26, 2010.

The Complainant also applied for European Union trademark registration for VERISURE RAPID RESPONSE (device mark) on December 12, 2024; this trademark has been registered on March 28, 2025, registration No. 019119156.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names containing the Trademark including <verisure.com>, which resolves to its official website promoting its products and services under the Trademark.

The disputed domain name was first registered on December 12, 2024. The disputed domain name is offered for sale via a website hosted by GoDaddy, for the asking price of USD 2,988.

The Complainant sent a Cease and Desist letter via the Registrar (along with reminders), as well as a contact request via the service provided by the Registrar. There was no response from the Respondent.

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name <verisurerapidresponse.com> on the same day of the Complainant's filing of European Union trademark registration for VERISURE RAPID RESPONSE.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name has been offered for sale for the asking price of USD 2,899, which is clearly in excess of the out of pocket costs incurred by the Respondent to register and maintain the disputed domain name.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondent's default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

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 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 Trademark VERISURE RAPID RESPONSE is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 evidence clearly demonstrates that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name on the same day of the Complainant's filing of European Union trademark registration for VERISURE RAPID RESPONSE. This obviously cannot be a coincidence.

The disputed domain name has been offered for sale for the same asking price of USD 2,899, an amount which is likely in excess of the out of pocket costs incurred by the Respondent to register the disputed domain name.

These circumstances, and the structure of the disputed domain name highlights the clear intention on the side of the Respondent to target the Complainant, in an attempt to obtain a commercial gain. The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

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 <verisurerapidresponse.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Richard C.K. van Oerle/

Richard C.K. van Oerle

Sole Panelist

Date: April 25, 2025