

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Barracuda Networks, Inc. v. Stephan Mills, Alfrod Waldens LLC
Case No. D2025-1366

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Barracuda Networks, Inc., United States of America, represented by KXT LAW, LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is Stephan Mills, Alfrod Waldens LLC, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <barracuda1networksinc.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 4, 2025. On April 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 4, 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 (Registration Private and Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 7, 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 April 11, 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 April 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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 has offered its goods and services in the business of cybersecurity and IT threat protection under the BARRACUDA mark since at least as early as December 2002. The Complainant also owns the <barracuda.com> and <barracudanetworks.com> domain names through which its goods and services are offered.

The Complainant owns the following registrations and application which incorporate the BARRACUDA mark:

UNITED STATES TRADEMARK	REGISTRATION/ APPLICATION DATE	REGISTRATION/SERIAL NUMBER	INTERNATIONAL CLASSES
BARRACUDA	April 7, 2015	4,715,332	9, 41, and 42
BARRACUDA NETWORKS	March 22, 2016	4,922,692	9, 41, and 42
BARRACUDAONE	October 4, 2023	98/208,702	9, 41, and 42

The domain name < barracuda1networksinc.com > was registered on February 28, 2025 (the “disputed domain name”).

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 Complainant’s BARRACUDA registered mark, its BARRACUDA NETWORKS registered mark, and its pending BARRACUDAONE mark because it incorporates all three trademarks in their entirety in a manner that causes confusing similarity. The addition of “inc” is an intentional attempt to create confusing similarity and add to the disputed domain name’s perceived credibility because Barracuda Networks, Inc. is Complainant’s business name. Furthermore, the addition of the number “1” is negligible when considering the disputed domain name as a whole. When consumers see the number “1” surrounded by the Complainant’s BARRACUDA NETWORKS mark and accompanying business name, consumers are more likely to disregard the “1” and focus on the Complainant’s mark and business name.

The Respondent is not and has not been commonly known as BARRACUDA, BARRACUDA NETWORKS, BARRACUDAONE, or the disputed domain name. Further, the disputed domain name is not descriptive, as proven by the Complainant’s trademarks. The Respondent has not established rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent appears to have registered the disputed domain name in an attempt to intentionally attract Internet users to its websites 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 best evidenced by the fact that the disputed domain name includes Complainant’s BARRACUDA and BARRACUDA NETWORKS registered marks. Furthermore, the addition of “inc” creates a higher likelihood of confusion because Barracuda Networks, Inc. is the Complainant’s full business name. By using a swathe of trademarks and other identifiers that consumers associate with the Complainant, consumers will immediately confuse the disputed domain name as originating from the Complainant.

The Complainant believes the registration of the disputed domain name is an intentional attempt to divert traffic from consumers trying to purchase the Complainant's goods and services by tricking them into believing that they are accessing the Complainant's website or by tricking them into believing that they are receiving marketing or other promotional material from <barracudanetworks.com> through the use of a spoofed <barracuda1networksinc.com> email address that would look confusingly similar to a legitimate email from the Complainant. The Complainant adds that by doing so, the disputed domain name could be used for phishing or other cyber-attacks. Any attempt to use the Complainant's protected trademarks for this purpose is particularly concerning, as the Complainant has long been in the business of cybersecurity and IT threat protection.

At the time of filing, the disputed domain name directs to pay-per-click ("PPC") webpages that list out multiple third-party links related to different advertisements covering contents such as "Personal Data Removal," "Online Web Application Scanner," and "Threat Detection Tool." The terms "Online Web Application Scanner" and "Threat Detection Tool" directly relate to Complainant's IT security business as Complainant offers and sells these types of goods and services to its customers.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the BARRACUDA and BARRACUDA NETWORKS marks and has shown that no other entity has rights in or uses the Complainant's mark. The addition of "1" and "inc" does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable in the disputed domain name. The generic Top-Level-Domain ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), sections 1.8 and 1.11.1, and *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org / Conan Corrigan*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2316](#).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has presented a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The fact that the Respondent obtained the disputed domain name over twenty years after the Complainant had begun using its BARRACUDA and BARRACUDA NETWORKS marks affirms that the Respondent sought to piggyback on the mark for illegitimate reasons.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

The Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The disputed domain name was registered years after the Complainant first registered and used its BARRACUDA and BARRACUDA NETWORKS marks and after the Complainant had started using its <barracuda.com> and <barracudanetworks.com> domain names. Considering the evidence on the record provided by the Complainant with respect to the extent of use of its BARRACUDA and BARRACUDA NETWORKS marks and the nature of the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks combined with the absence of any evidence provided by the Respondent to the contrary, it is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the disputed domain name was registered, the Respondent undoubtedly knew of the Complainant's BARRACUDA and BARRACUDA NETWORKS marks, and knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

There is no apparent benign reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name that is a typo variant of the Complainant's marks.

Currently, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, but this does not prevent a finding of bad faith, noting the reputation of the BARRACUDA and BARRACUDA NETWORKS marks, and the composition of the disputed domain name, as well as the provided evidence that the Respondent's website previously was used for PPC website featuring links to Complainant's competitors. See section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel finds that the only plausible basis for registering and using the disputed domain name has been in bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <barracuda1networksinc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/

Colin T. O'Brien

Sole Panelist

Date: June 5, 2025