

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cisco Technology, Inc. v. Orlando Camacho
Case No. D2025-1695

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cisco Technology, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fenwick & West LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Orlando Camacho, Bolivia (Plurinational State of).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cisco-latam.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 26, 2025. On April 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 28, 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, DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 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 May 2, 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 May 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Daniel Peña as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 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 worldwide technology conglomerate, providing a wide array of products and services ranging from networking and communications equipment and software, including telephone communications systems, video conferencing systems, and collaboration products and services, to financing services, retail store services, training and certification programs and blogs. The Complainant provides its varied products and services to a diverse customer base that spans all industries and includes individual consumers, small to medium-sized businesses, enterprises, service providers and governmental entities.

The Complainant's affiliate, Cisco Systems, Inc., a public company traded on NASDAQ and listed in the Dow Jones Industrial Average, has more than 75,000 employees in countries throughout the world.

The Complainant owns worldwide trademark registrations for its well-known CISCO trademark, including in several Latin American countries:

- United States trademark registration number 73734349 for CISCO, registered on June 6, 1989; and
- Mexican trademark registration number 1167270 for CISCO, registered on July 6, 2010.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 18, 2024. It leads to a website that falsely appears to be connected to the Complainant, using their logo and calling itself the "Centro de Verificación de Certificaciones y Autorizaciones CISCO Latinoamérica" (which means "CISCO Latin America Certification and Authorization Verification Center" in English).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that it has met all the requirements under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has used its famous CISCO trademark to market and sell its products since 1984. The Complainant has expended considerable resources in promoting and advertising its CISCO products and services, and in building valuable goodwill in its CISCO brand. As a consequence of such longstanding use and extensive promotional efforts, the CISCO trademark can be considered an internationally famous trademark and has been found to be "well known" and famous in prior UDRP decisions. In particular, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its well-known CISCO trademark and domain names. The Respondent's disputed domain name fully incorporates the CISCO mark. The addition of the geographic term "Latam" misleadingly suggests an affiliation with the Complainant's operations in Latin America, where the Complainant has a long-established presence, including significant sales and promotional activities under the CISCO brand.

The Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and was not authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark.

The disputed domain name is used in connection with a website that falsely appears to be a website for, or associated with, the Complainant, using the Complainant's logo and describing itself as a "Centro de Verificación de Certificaciones y Autorizaciones CISCO Latinoamérica". The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy each of the three following elements: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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. No Response or any kind of communication has been submitted by the Respondent, despite the Center has properly notified the Complaint to the Respondent in accordance with paragraph 2(a) of the Rules. Therefore, this Panel shall decide this dispute based on paragraph 15(a) of the Rules and will analyze the evidence submitted by the Complainant on the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence" standard. See, paragraphs 14 and 15(a) of the Rules, and WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.2.

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.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the CISCO trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's CISCO mark along with the term "latam", which is a common abbreviation of Latin America, and a hyphen. The addition of the term "latam" to the Complainant's CISCO mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. The Panel further notes that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") "com" is required only for technical reasons and is generally ignored for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's trademark to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant bears the burden of proof in establishing this requirement. In view of the difficulties inherent in proving a negative and because the relevant information is mainly in the possession of the Respondent, it is sufficient for the Complainant to establish a prima facie case which, if not rebutted by relevant evidence from the Respondent, will lead to this ground being satisfied.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case showing that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name, is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, and the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark to register any domain name.

Given the alleged use of the disputed domain name to operate a deceptive website that displays the Complainant's CISCO mark, that attempts to solicit certificate-related inquiries, and that according to the Complainant to issue fraudulent Cisco partner certificates for commercial gain, there is a suggestion of a false affiliation between the disputed domain name with the Complainant's Latin American operations.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not filed any Response and thus did not deny the Complainant's assertions, nor brought any information or evidence for demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered evidence of the registration and use of a disputed domain name in bad faith: (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; (ii) the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; (iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

With regard to the bad faith at the time of registration, the Panel notes that CISCO is not a common or descriptive term, but a renowned trademark in and to which the Complainant has demonstrated has rights. The disputed domain name reproduces, without any authorization or approval, the Complainant's registered trademarks. Moreover, the disputed domain name is inherently misleading as it reproduces the Complainant's CISCO trademark together with the term "latam", which is a common abbreviation of Latin America, and a hyphen. In addition, owing to the substantial presence established by the Complainant worldwide, it is very unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. In addition, the website at the disputed domain name displays the Complainant's CISCO trademark. Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, had knowledge of the Complainant's earlier rights to the CISCO trademark.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name resolves to a deceptive website that falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. The site displays the Complainant's trademarks and logo, featuring the phrase "Centro de Verificación de Certificaciones y Autorizaciones CISCO Latinoamérica" (which means "CISCO Latin America Certification and Authorization Verification Center" in English), with the intention to imitate the Complainant's official website and mislead users. It directs users to send certification inquiries to "[...]@cisco-latam.com," and, according to the Complainant, the Respondent appears to issue fake Cisco certificates. This conduct does not constitute a legitimate or bona fide use, but rather demonstrates clear bad faith aimed at confusing users and obtaining commercial benefit through deception. Considering all circumstances, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has unlawfully attempted to impersonate the Complainant. As outlined in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4, such use is evidence of bad faith registration and use.

Accordingly, the Panel finds, based on the evidence presented, that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Therefore, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <cisco-latam.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Daniel Peña/

Daniel Peña

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2025