

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Principal Financial Services, Inc. v. CodexTech IT, Codex Tech-IT
Case No. D2025-1944

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Principal Financial Services, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Neal & McDevitt, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is CodexTech IT, Codex Tech-IT, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <principalfinancials.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 15, 2025. On May 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 15, 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, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 19, 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 the same day.

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 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 11, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on May 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier 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

The Complainant is a financial services institution headquartered in Des Moines, Iowa, United States. It states that it operates on a multi-national basis and offers services in the financial, insurance, investment, banking, retirement, asset management, real estate and healthcare sectors.

The Complainant is the owner of various registrations for the trademarks PRINCIPAL and PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP, including:

- United States registration number 1562541 for the individual mark PRINCIPAL, registered on October 24, 1989, in International Class 36; and
- United States registration number 4483644 for the word mark PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP, registered on February 18, 2014, in International Class 36.

The Complainant maintains additional word or figurative registrations for the mark PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP in territories including Chile, Australia, Singapore, and the Republic of Korea.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.principal.com”. It states that it owns other domain names including <principalfinancial.com>, although that domain name does not appear to resolve to any active website. According to a Whois search, that domain name was first registered in July 1997.¹

The Complainant’s trademark PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP has been held by prior panels under the UDRP to have attained the status of a well-known trademark (see e.g. *Principal Financial Services, Inc. v. Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / bei shang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1509](#)).

The disputed domain name was registered on August 27, 2024.

The disputed domain name appears at all material times to have resolved to a Registrar-operated holding page indicating that no website has as yet been uploaded.

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.

The Complainant submits that it and its predecessor in interest have offered financial services under the trademark PRINCIPAL since as early as 1960, and that it has invested over USD 1 billion in its trademarks over the years.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its PRINCIPAL and PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP trademarks. It states the disputed domain name incorporates the former

¹As discussed in paragraph 4.8 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision.

trademark in full, and that the latter trademark is recognizable within in the disputed domain name, notwithstanding the Respondent's adoption of the plural term "financials".

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has never authorized it to use its PRINCIPAL or PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP trademarks, that the Respondent has not commonly been known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent is making neither bona fide commercial use nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. It states that the disputed domain name is virtually identical to its well-known PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP trademark, thereby raising a presumption of registration in bad faith. It adds that the Respondent was, or should have been, aware of its trademarks within the financial services sector, and that its registration of the disputed domain name amounts to "cybersquatting". The Complainant submits further that MX (mail exchanger) records have been configured upon the disputed domain name, raising the possibility that it may be used for malicious "phishing" or impersonation schemes.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent states that it registered the disputed domain name "with the intent of being used for a future financial consulting platform." It denies having had any knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks or of any potential trademark conflict. It states that it has never offered the disputed domain name for sale, whether to the Complainant or otherwise, and has no intention to profit from any existing brand.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates what the Panel considers to be the dominant portion of that trademark, with the addition of the letter "s". Neither this nor the omission of the dictionary term "group" prevents the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In the view of the Panel, the Complainant's submissions above give rise to a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent contends that it registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of a future financial consulting platform, although it provides no further details and exhibits no evidence of any preparations to use the disputed domain name for that purpose.

The mere registration of a domain name cannot of itself confer rights or legitimate interests, and the Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL has been found by prior panels under the UDRP to have attained the status of a well-known trademark.

As discussed in section 3.1.4 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#):

"Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith."

Section 3.1.1 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) also observes:

"Particularly where the domain name at issue is identical or confusingly similar to a highly distinctive or famous mark, panels have tended to view with a degree of skepticism a respondent defense that the domain name was merely registered for legitimate speculation (based for example on any claimed dictionary meaning) as opposed to targeting a specific brand owner".

While the disputed domain name in this case is not identical to the Complainant's trademark PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP, it is highly similar to the distinctive portion of that trademark in adopting the terms "principal" and "financials". Further, the disputed domain name is virtually identical to the Complainant's own (albeit non-resolving) domain name <principalfinancial.com>.

The Respondent does not explain its choice of the word "financials" as opposed to the (perhaps more obvious) "financial" for, supposedly, a future financial consulting platform. Moreover, the Panel notes the Respondent's name (and website) suggests that its core business is in the IT sector, and the Respondent has not provided any explanation for its purported entry into the financial sector or any evidence regarding proposed business plans associated with the disputed domain name. These factors raise suspicions in the mind of the Panel as to the Respondent's mala fides and prior awareness of the Complainant's trademark rights.

In any event, taking all of the available evidence into account, the Panel is not persuaded that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights, or for the purpose of any bona fide commercial venture without intent to target the Complainant's commercial goodwill. On the contrary, given the well-known status of the Complainant's trademark and the paucity of the Respondent's explanation and evidence, the Panel finds it more likely on balance that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the knowledge of the Complainant's PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP trademark and with the intention of taking unfair commercial advantage of it.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <principalfinancials.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2025