

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Kforce Inc. v. Peter Wilson, Domain Administrator, William LLC, Fred Will  
Case No. D2025-1455

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Kforce Inc., United States of America ("US"), represented by Thomas & LoCicero PL, US.

The Respondent is Peter Wilson, Nigeria; Domain Administrator and William LLC, Fred Will, US.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar[s]**

The disputed domain names <kforceereg.com>, <kforcereg.co> and <kforcereg.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 9, 2025. On April 9, 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 (Peter Wilson/See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant April 11, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), 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 an amended Complaint on April 17, 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 April 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 15, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 16, 2025.

The Center appointed William Lobelson as the sole panelist in this matter on May 19, 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 Kforce, Inc., a US based corporation, offering employments services for job seekers and staffing services.

It owns and exploits the domain name <kforce.com>, registered in 1999, as well as a number of trademark registrations for KFORCE:

- US Registrations Nos. 2 494 832 (registered on October 2, 2001), 2625418 (registered on September 24, 2002), 4494626 (registered on March 11, 2014), 4558863 (registered on July 1, 2014)
- European Union Trade Mark No. 007561335 (registered on September 9, 2009)

The disputed domain names are:

<kforcereg.com>, created January 7, 2025;  
<kforcereg.co>, created January 13, 2025; and  
<kforceereg.com>, created February 17, 2025

The Complainant found that the disputed domain names <kforcereg.co> and <kforceereg.com> were both used as email addresses to send out fraudulent emails, impersonating the Complainant (using signature blocks that are almost identical to those of the Complainant's employees), seeking personal information from Internet users, and inviting them to visit the third disputed domain name <kforcereg.com>, which routed to a copycat of the Complainant's official web site (including same contents, text, photos and the trademark KFORCE).

The Complainant served a first cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on January 28, 2025 in relation with the disputed domain names <kforcereg.co> and <kforcereg.com>, to which the Respondent Peter Wilson replied on the same date, claiming his good faith (as being involved in an educational exercise to practice web-development skills), agreeing to cease the infringement of Complainant's trademark, but demanding a monetary compensation. The Complainant refused to proceed with any payment and the Respondent did not take any further action.

The Complainant served a second cease-and-desist letter on April 4, 2025 in relation with the disputed domain name <kforceereg.com>, to which no response was ever brought.

#### **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 its earlier trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names have been registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant puts the emphasis on the fact that the disputed domain names were used to impersonate the Complainant, and for phishing purposes.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Notwithstanding the default of the Respondent, it remains incumbent on the Complainant to make out its case in all respects under the Rules set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Namely, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (paragraph 4(a)(i));
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(a)(ii)); and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii)).

### **Consolidation: Multiple Respondents**

The 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 web sites 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.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- the three disputed domain names were registered at very close dates, with the same Registrar;
- two of them have been used to send out the same fraudulent emails and both invited Internet users to refer to the third one;
- when the Complainant served a cease-and-desist letter pertaining to two of the disputed domain names, the Respondent replied for both.

The Panel finds that the consolidation should be granted.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel 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 (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

### **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.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. 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 other letters (here “reg”, and “ereg”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms do 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.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, phishing and impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel also notes the explanation given by the Respondent to the Complainant in response to the cease-and-desist letter he was served, namely that he was involved in an educational exercise to practice web-development skills; however, this unsupported contention does not legitimize the use of the disputed domain names. The <kforcereg.co> and <kforceereg.com> disputed domain names were both been used to send nearly identical fraudulent emails, each of which then directed recipients to the third disputed domain, <kforcereg.com>, the same being routed to a copycat of the Complainant’s web site.

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 Respondent:

- has provided fake details in the Whois record in respect of the disputed domain name <kforcereg.co>, using a genuine address of the Complainant,
- has used two of the disputed domain names for phishing purposes,
- has used the third disputed domain name in relation with a web site that copies the contents of the Complainant's official web site and thus impersonates the Complainant,
- has tried to justify the bad faith of its actions when responding to the cease-and-desist letter he was served without convincing contentions or evidence and demanding a monetary compensation to the Complainant to grant back the disputed domain names.

It appears indisputable to the Panel that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names is to impersonate Complainant and for phishing purposes.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, phishing and impersonation/passing off (or other types of fraud), constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <kforceereg.com>, <kforcereg.co> and <kforcereg.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/William Lobelson/*

**William Lobelson**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 27, 2025