

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal v. Sam Smith
Case No. D2025-1534

1. The Parties

Complainant is Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Cozen O'Connor, United States.

Respondent is Sam Smith, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alliedsecurityhr.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 15, 2025. On April 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 14, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0174271413) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 25, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 28, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 27, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on May 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Timothy D. Casey as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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 is a security services company based in the United States that operates in at least 90 countries and employs approximately 800,000 employees globally, including a large number of employees in North America. Complainant has operated since 1957 and has a registration for the trademark “ALLIED SECURITY” in the United States (the “ALLIED SECURITY Mark”) as follows:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Class(es)	Registration No.	Registration Date
ALLIED SECURITY	United States	45	2680917	January 28, 2003

The disputed domain name was registered March 3, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website under construction.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it has rights in the ALLIED SECURITY Mark, as evidenced herein, which it has used at least since 1957, and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ALLIED SECURITY Mark because the disputed domain name incorporates the ALLIED SECURITY Mark. Complainant contends that the addition of the term “hr” is a commonly known and used abbreviation for “human resources,” and that its mere addition fails to distinguish, and in fact increases, the likelihood of confusion between the ALLIED SECURITY Mark and the disputed domain name, as consumers may believe the disputed domain name is affiliated with Complainant’s human resources department. Complainant further contends that the generic Top-Level Domain in the disputed domain name should be disregarded for purposes of determining confusing similarity.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, is not affiliated with Complainant, and cites no evidence suggesting Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to advance legitimate interests or for the bona fide offering of goods or services. Complainant further contends that Respondent’s use of a privacy service draws an adverse inference that Respondent registered the disputed domain name to evade the consequences of registering a disputed domain name for which it has no rights or legitimate interests. Complainant further contends Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that it has not authorized, licensed, or endorsed Respondent use of the ALLIED SECURITY Mark.

Complainant contends that Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name was in bad faith. Complainant contends that Respondent had the ALLIED SECURITY Mark in mind when the disputed domain name was registered and did so with the intent of trading off of Complainant’s goodwill in the ALLIED SECURITY Mark and to confuse consumers into believing the disputed domain name was affiliated with or associated with Complainant by using the descriptor “hr” with the ALLIED SECURITY Mark.

Complainant contends that Respondent’s use of a privacy service supports the inference that Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name was in bad faith. Complainant further contends that Respondent’s passive use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith. Lastly, Complainant contends that Respondent has registered the disputed domain name for the bad faith purpose of intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to Respondent’s website for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "hr," may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 Panel notes that Complainant and its mark have a significant global presence, in particular in the United States, such that the Panel finds it most likely that the United States-based Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant's mark when registering the confusingly similar disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, including a "coming soon" page, 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 distinctiveness and reputation of Complainant's trademark, the failure of Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <alliedsecurityhr.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Timothy D. Casey/

Timothy D. Casey

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2025