

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Verizon Trademark Services LLC v. JOAO ANTONIO, 52408525000164, Talys Guedes, quizinterativo, Roger Machado, Tm BLACK, Patolino DoRoi, Kayke Roberto dos Santos, LEANDRO GABRIEL ALVIENE MOURA, Lucas Alves, lucival bernard, SAMP FORT MADEIREIRA LTDA, Cred Verizon, jose Roberto, geraldo felix, Rayane Selvino, RAYANE DA SILVA SELVINO, Victor Sudre, Luana Martins, victor jorge, Lucas Cardoso, Grupo VGN, Sampeia Macake

Case No. D2025-1417

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Verizon Trademark Services LLC, United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondents are JOAO ANTONIO, 52408525000164, Talys Guedes, quizinterativo, Roger Machado, Tm BLACK, Patolino DoRoi, Kayke Roberto dos Santos, LEANDRO GABRIEL ALVIENE MOURA, Lucas Alves, lucival bernard, SAMP FORT MADEIREIRA LTDA, Cred Verizon, jose Roberto, geraldo felix, Rayane Selvino, RAYANE DA SILVA SELVINO, Victor Sudre, Luana Martins, victor jorge, Lucas Cardoso, Grupo VGN, and Sampeia Macake, all located in Brazil.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <anuidade-verizon.site>, <ativacao-verizon.site>, <aumento-verizon-card.site>, <bancoverizon.site>, <cardverizon.site>, <consultaverizon.com>, <creditoverizon.shop>, <credverizon.shop>, <deposito-verizon-card.site>, <envios-verizon-card.site>, <imposto-verizon-card.site>, <seguro-verizon-card.site>, <seguroverizon.site>, <seucartaoverizon.com>, <soliciteverizon.online>, <verizonnoticias.online>, <verizonpayments.shop>, <verizom.online>, <verizonaprovado.online>, <verizoncartao.com>, <verizon-credito.site>, <verizoncredito.site>, <verizonec.shop>, <verizonlimit.site>, <verizonservicos.online>, <verizonsolucoes.online>, <verizonsolucoes.tech>, and <verzonconsulte.site> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 31, 2025. On April 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 10, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the

Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy Protect, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 2, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed the first amended Complaint on May 28, 2025, requesting to remove 72 domain names and add another eight disputed domain names into the current proceedings, namely, <cardverizon.site>, <seguroverizon.site>, <soliciteverizon.online>, <verzionnoticias.online>, <verzionpayments.shop>, <verizonaprovado.online>, <verizoncredito.site> and <verzonconsulte.site>.

On June 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the newly added disputed domain names. On June 12, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the newly added disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents and contact information in the first amended Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 4, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar for the newly added disputed domain names, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed the second amended Complaint on July 9, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2025. The Respondent Cred Verizon sent several email communications to the Center on July 16, 2025. The Center notified the Parties that it will proceed to panel appointment on August 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on August 14, 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

Founded on June 30, 2000, and headquartered in New York, United States, the Complainant is one of the world's leading providers of technology and communications products and services, with an operating structure that focuses on two customer-facing areas: Consumer and Business.

With revenues of USD 134.8 billion in 2024, operating in over 150 countries around the world, the Complainant offers voice, data and video services and solutions delivering on customers' demand for mobility, reliable network connectivity, security and control and is one of the first companies in the world to launch commercial 5G for mobility, fixed wireless and mobile edge computing.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for VERIZON, including the following, as per trademark registration certificates submitted in Annex C to the Complaint:

- United States trademark registration No. 2886813 for VERIZON (word mark), filed on September 10, 1999, and registered on September 21, 2004, in international classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 42; and

- United States trademark registration No. 5223839 for VERIZON (figurative mark), filed on August 31, 2015, and registered on June 13, 2017, in international class 35.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <verizon.com>, which was registered on March 6, 2000, and is used by the Complainant to promote its products and services under the trademark VERIZON.

The disputed domain names: <verizonsolucoes.online>, registered on December 5, 2024; <verizonservicos.online>, registered on January 9, 2025; <bancoverizon.site>, registered on January 22, 2025; <envios-verizon-card.site>, registered on February 10, 2025; <anuidade-verizon.site>, <ativacao-verizon.site>, <aumento-verizon-card.site>, <deposito-verizon-card.site>, <imposto-verizon-card.site>, <seguro-verizon-card.site>, <verizonec.shop>, <verizon-cartao.com>, and <verizonsolucoes.tech>, registered on February 11, 2025; <consultaverizon.com>, <seucartaooverizon.com>, and <verizom.online>, registered on February 12, 2025; <verizon-credito.site>, registered on March 15, 2025; <creditoverizon.shop>, and <verizonlimit.site>, registered on March 17, 2025; <credverizon.shop>, registered on March 23, 2025; <cardverizon.site>, registered on March 25, 2025; <soliciteverizon.online>, registered on March 28, 2025; <seguroverizon.site>, registered on April 2, 2025; <verizononcredito.site>, registered on April 15, 2025; <verzionnoticias.online> and <verizionpayments.shop>, registered on April 19, 2025; <verzonconsulte.site>, registered on April 29, 2025; and <verizonaprovado.online>, registered on May 7, 2025, do not currently resolve to active websites.

However, according to the screenshots provided in Annex G to the Complaint, which have not been contested by the Respondents, prior to the present proceeding, the disputed domain names: <verizonec.shop>, <verizon-cartao.com>, <consultaverizon.com>, <verizon-credito.site>, <creditoverizon.shop>, <verizonlimit.site>, <credverizon.shop>, <cardverizon.site>, <soliciteverizon.online>, <seguroverizon.site>, <verizononcredito.site>, <verzionnoticias.online>, <verizionpayments.shop>, <verzonconsulte.site>, <verizonsolucoes.online>, and <verizonaprovado.online> were all pointed to active websites publishing the Complainant's VERIZON marks and advertising pre-approved credit card services.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark VERIZON in which the Complainant has rights as they either reproduce the trademark in its entirety or with obvious misspellings, with the mere addition of the Portuguese terms "anuidade" ("annuity"), "aprovado" ("approved"), "ativacao" ("activate"), "aumento" ("increase"), "banco" ("bank"), "cartao" ("card"), "consulte/a" ("consultation"), "cred(ito)" ("credit"), "deposito" ("deposit"), "envios" ("shipments"), "imposto" ("tax"), "seguro" ("insurance"), "servicos" ("services"), "seu" ("your"), "solucoes" ("solutions"), the English terms "card" and "limit" and the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLD's") ".com", ".online", ".shop", ".site" and ".tech".

The Complainant submits that the addition of other terms to the VERIZON mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, especially since such additional terms are suggestive of the Complainant's VERIZON branded financial, insurance, and retail related services offerings.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, the Complainant states that: i) the Complainant has in no way authorized, licensed or otherwise consented the Respondents to use its VERIZON mark in any way including for the registration of the disputed domain names; ii) the

Respondents have never sought or obtained any trademark registrations or rights for the VERIZON mark or any variation thereof; iii) the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names; iv) many of the disputed domain names have been used by the Respondents in connection with active commercial websites advertising pre-approved credit card services, a use which does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use considering Respondents intended to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation in the market place.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that the Respondents were aware of the Complainant's rights in the VERIZON mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names as the VERIZON mark became famous mark well prior to the Respondents' registration and use of the disputed domain names. The Complainant submits that the Respondents' registrations and use of the disputed domain names that are confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known mark are indicative of opportunistic bad faith.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names, incorporating the Complainant's well-known trademark, to attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondents' websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondents' websites. The Complainant points out that, as highlighted by the screenshots in Annex G to the Complaint, many of the disputed domain names have been pointed to websites displaying the VERIZON figurative mark and offering an unauthorized high credit limit pre-approved Platinum Mastercard called "Verizon Card", which may be confused with the Complainant's Verizon Visa credit card offered on the Complainant's official website. The Complainant concludes that the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names dilutes and tarnishes the VERIZON marks and causes harm and detriment to Complainant's reputation and the VERIZON marks.

The Complainant further contends that, in registering 28 disputed domain names combining the Complainant's famous VERIZON mark, or obvious misspellings thereof, with generic Portuguese language words which are indicative of Complainant's products and services, the Respondents have clearly established a pattern of abusive conduct, preventing the Complainant from reflecting its mark in corresponding domain names.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions.

On July 16, 2025, the Respondent, Cred Verizon sent several email communications in Portuguese to the Center, indicating that he was not aware of any misuse of the VERIZON trademark or related domain names and that he had been the victim of misuse of his personal data.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The second amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.11.2.

The Complainant asserted that the disputed domain names, although registered in the name of different individuals and entities, are under common control since:

- i) At least one or more of the disputed domain names owned by each named Respondent, has been used in connection with a website displaying the header "Verizon Pagamentos" and claiming to offer a "Verizon Card" in Brazil.
- ii) The active disputed domain names resolved to virtually identical websites.
- iii) The phone numbers and email addresses indicated in the Registrar-provided WhoIs of the disputed domain names are similar.

The Panel also notes that: i) all disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademark VERIZON, or obvious misspellings thereof, ii) all the disputed domain names have been registered through the same Registrar; and iii) according to the Registrar-provided registrant information, all registrants are located in Brazil.

The Panel finds that the elements highlighted above demonstrate a common control of the disputed domain names by the Respondents.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel therefore sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding. The Respondents are hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent".

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain names registered by the Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 names. [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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for VERIZON.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is entirely reproduced in the disputed domain names <anuidade-verizon.site>, <ativacao-verizon.site>, <aumento-verizon-card.site>, <bancoverizon.site>, <cardverizon.site>, <consultaverizon.com>, <creditoverizon.shop>, <credverizon.shop>, <deposito-verizon-card.site>, <envios-verizon-card.site>, <imposto-verizon-card.site>, <seguro-verizon-card.site>, <seguroverizon.site>, <seucartaooverizon.com>, <soliciteverizon.online>, <verizonaprovado.online>, <verizon-cartao.com>, <verizon-credito.site>, <verizoncredit.shop>, <verizonlimit.site>, <verizonsolucoes.online>, <verizonsolucoes.tech>, <verizonc.shop> and <verizonservicos.online> and highly recognizable despite the obvious misspellings, in the disputed domain names <verizonnoticias.online>, <verizonpayments.shop>, <verizom.online> and <verzonconsulte.site> - where the VERIZON mark has been reproduced with the mere addition, deletion or replacement of one letter. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the Portuguese terms “anuidade” (“annuity”), “aprovado” (“approved”), “ativacao” (“activate”), “aumento” (“increase”), “banco” (“bank”), “cartao” (“card”), “consulte/a” (“consultation”), “cred(ito)” (“credit”), “deposito” (“deposit”), “envios” (“shipments”), “imposto” (“tax”), “seguro” (“insurance”), “servicos” (services), “seu” (your), “solucoes” (“solutions”) and of the English terms “card” and “limit” 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 disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Moreover, the gTLDs added to the trademark, like the gTLDs “.com”, “.online”, “.shop”, “.site”, and “.tech” in this case, can be viewed as a standard registration requirement and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not affiliated to, or licensed by, the Complainant, nor has the Respondent obtained authorization to use the Complainant's trademark or to register the disputed domain names.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain names, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Panel notes that one of the disputed domain names, <credverizon.shop>, is registered in the name of "Cred Verizon", but considering i) the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website offering prepaid card services under the VERIZON mark, and ii) the registrant email address for this disputed domain name was used to communicate with the Center indicating that his contact details had been misused, the Panel finds that such circumstance is not sufficient to conclude that this Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

As mentioned above, the disputed domain names all currently resolve to inactive websites, though according to the Complainant's submissions – which have not been contested by the Respondent, prior to the present proceeding the 16 disputed domain names <verizonc.shop>, <verizon-cartao.com>, <consultaverizon.com>, <verizon-credito.site>, <creditoverizon.shop>, <verizonlimit.site>, <credverizon.shop>, <cardverizon.site>, <soliciteverizon.online>, <seguroverizon.site>, <verizoncredito.site>, <verzionnoticias.online>, <verzionpayments.shop>, <verzonconsulte.site>, <verizonsolucoes.online>, and <verizonaprovado.online> were directed to active websites advertising pre-approved credit card services under the VERIZON marks.

The Panel notes that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names described above suggests that the Respondent intended to attract internet users to their websites, passing off as the Complainant and/or suggesting an affiliation with it, and finds that such use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademarks.

As to the circumstance that the remaining 12 disputed domain names <anuidade-verizon.site>, <ativacao-verizon.site>, <aumento-verizon-card.site>, <bancoverizon.site>, <deposito-verizon-card.site>, <envios-verizon-card.site>, <imposto-verizon-card.site>, <seguro-verizon-card.site>, <seucartaoverizon.com>, <verizom.online>, <verizonservicos.online>, and <verizonsolucoes.tech> do not appear to have been actively used according to the records, the Panel notes that, as held in *Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America v. Wreaks Communications Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0483](#), absent some contrary evidence from Respondent, passive holding of a domain name does not constitute "legitimate non-commercial or fair use". The Panel further notes that all such disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's well-known trademark VERIZON in its entirety with the mere addition of one letter (in the case of <verizom.online>) or other non-distinctive terms and, therefore, are inherently misleading as they suggest an affiliation with the Complainant. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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, in view of the Complainant's prior registration and use of the trademark VERIZON in connection with the Complainant's technology and communications products and services, promoted online via the Complainant's website "www.verizon.com", and considering the well-known character of the mark, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, in view of the prior redirection of the disputed domain names <verizonc.shop>, <verizon-cartao.com>, <consultaverizon.com>, <verizon-credito.site>, <creditoverizon.shop>, <verizonlimit.site>, <credverizon.shop>, <cardverizon.site>, <soliciteverizon.online>, <seguroverizon.site>, <verizoncredito.site>, <verzionnoticias.online>, <verzionpayments.shop>, <verzonconsulte.site>, <verizonsolucoes.online>, and

<verizonaprovado.online> to active websites publishing the Complainant's VERIZON marks and advertising pre-approved credit card services similar to the ones offered by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent was actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its marks.

In addition, considering the use of the disputed domain names in connection with the websites described above, the Panel finds that the Respondent used the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to their websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of their websites.

As indicated above, 12 disputed domain names do not appear to have been used in connection with active websites, and all the disputed domain names do not currently resolve to active webpages. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 reputation of the Complainant's mark and, considering the composition of the disputed domain names, the Respondent's failure to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain names may be put, finds that, under the circumstances, the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 names <anuidade-verizon.site>, <ativacao-verizon.site>, <aumento-verizon-card.site>, <bancoverizon.site>, <cardverizon.site>, <consultaverizon.com>, <creditoverizon.shop>, <credverizon.shop>, <deposito-verizon-card.site>, <envios-verizon-card.site>, <imposto-verizon-card.site>, <seguro-verizon-card.site>, <seguroverizon.site>, <seucartaooverizon.com>, <soliciteverizon.online>, <verizonnoticias.online>, <verizonpayments.shop>, <verizom.online>, <verizonaprovado.online>, <verizoncartao.com>, <verizon-credito.site>, <verizoncredito.site>, <verizonc.shop>, <verizonlimit.site>, <verizonservicos.online>, <verizonsolucoes.online>, <verizonsolucoes.tech>, and <verzonconsulte.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: August 28, 2025