

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Asurion, LLC v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC  
Case No. D2025-2229

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Asurion, LLC, United States of America, represented by Adams and Reese LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <nonprod-asurion.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 June 6, 2025. On June 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 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 June 16, 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 June 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on July 28, 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 Asurion, LLC, a United States limited liability company incorporated in the state of Delaware, with headquarters in Nashville, Tennessee, United States.

The Complainant offers insurance, technology, mobile phone replacement, configuration, technical support, IT consultation, and related products and services under the ASURION mark. The Complainant has been active since at least as early as 1994 and has used the mark ASURION since at least as early as 2001.

The Complainant advertises and sells its products and services through its website and related websites, as well as through print media and other advertising and promotional campaigns.

The Complainant has served over 280 million consumers worldwide, and its services are made available by retailers worldwide, including some of the largest retailers in the United States. The Complainant has over seven-hundred locations throughout the United States, as well as many other corporate offices, supply chain locations, and customer care and tech support centers throughout North and South America, Europe, Australia, and Asia.

The Complainant has used its ASURION trademark to protect its products and services for more than 24 years.

The Complainant presented in this case evidence that proves that it is the owner of the registered ASURION trademark in many countries, for example, the following ones:

Country	Trademark	Application Number	Application Date	Registration number	Registration date
United States	ASURION	76215616	February 21, 2001	2698459	March 18, 2003
United States	ASURION	85486099	December 2, 2011	4179272	July 24, 2012
United States	ASURION	86828887	November 23, 2015	4997781	July 12, 2016
United States	ASURION	87403361	April 7, 2017	6010609	March 17, 2020
United States	ASURION	90978688	January 18, 2021	6944769	January 3, 2023
United States	ASURION	97617599	October 3, 2022	7157282	September 5, 2023
United States	ASURION	90340368	November 24, 2020	7001160	March 14, 2023
United States	ASURION	97039573	September 22, 2021	7689572	February 11, 2025

The Complainant and its licensees to this day, owns many domain names that incorporate the ASURION trademark including but not limited to the following: <asurion.biz>, <asurion.co>, <asurion.net>, <asurion.org> and <asurion.repair>.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <asurion.com> which was registered on January 23, 2001 and hosts the Complainant's official website.

The Respondent is located in Saint Kitts and Nevis.

The disputed domain name was created on June 4, 2025, which is used to redirect Internet users to the Complainant's own official website "www.asurion.com" without the Complainant's authorization.

## 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ASURION trademark since it includes the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, with the inclusion of the term "nonprod" which is commonly used in the technology and IT industries as shorthand for "nonproduction," referring to internal or test environment, and the Complainant offers technology and IT consultancy services, the addition of the term "nonprod" in the disputed domain name actually serves to increase the confusing similarity rather than to differentiate it from the Complainant's ASURION trademark. Also, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests concerning the disputed domain name, and finally, that the Respondent registered and is being used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

### B. Respondent

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "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 requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (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.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

### 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 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 "nonprod" and the hyphen, 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Additionally, it is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) (in this case “.com”) is generally disregarded when considering whether a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the complainant has rights. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 disputed 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. Therefore, 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 disputed 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 where the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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 name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

To the Complainant’s knowledge, “asurion” is not the Respondent’s name, and the Respondent is not and has never been commonly known as “asurion.” Also, the Respondent is not and has never been a licensee or franchisee of the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to register or use the Complainant’s ASURION trademark or to incorporate in any domain name, such as the disputed domain name.

According to the Complaint, the Complainant has not authorized or granted a license to the Respondent to use its trademark. Furthermore, the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain name. In the present case, the Respondent did not present any evidence that could demonstrate that it was preparing to use the disputed domain name corresponding to it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before receiving notice of the dispute. The Respondent is also not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the trademark, without intent for commercial gain, to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s ASURION trademark.

According to the evidence presented by the Complainant, the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to the Complainant’s official website, without the Complainant’s authorization. It is a common view of the UDRP panels that use of the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to the Complainant’s website cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name to the Respondent.

Additionally, without authorization from the Complainant, no actual or contemplated bona fide nor legitimate use of the disputed domain name could reasonably be claimed by the Respondent, as the ASURION trademark was famous at the time of registration, due to the Complainant’s extensive use and promotion of the mark throughout the world for more than 20 years. Previous UDRP panels have found that in the absence of any license or permission from the complainant to use a well-known trademark such as ASURION, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the domain name could reasonably be claimed.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case where the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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 name, such as those enumerated in the Policy.

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 which 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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, which was registered before the disputed domain name. Given the well-established reputation of the Complainant's ASURION trademarks in respect of their products and services, it is unlikely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name by chance. The Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant is further confirmed by the fact that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's website.

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. Circumstances indicating that a domain name was registered for the bad-faith including the nature of the domain name (e.g., whether a typo of a famous mark, a domain name wholly incorporating the relevant mark plus a geographic term or one related to the complainant's area of commercial activity, or a pure dictionary term) and the distinctiveness of the trademark at issue, among other factors, are relevant to this inquiry. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of 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.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to Complainant's official website indicates a deliberate attempt to confuse consumers into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated with or sponsored by the Complainant. Numerous UDRP panels have held that redirection of a domain name to the complainant's website supports a finding that a respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent's redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's official website "reinforces the likelihood of confusion" and "Internet users are likely to consider the disputed domain name as in some way endorsed by or connected with the Complainant, particularly taking into consideration the reputation of the Mark." *Ann Summers Limited v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Mingchun Chen*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0625](#). Moreover, because the Respondent retains control over the redirection of the disputed domain name, the Respondent creates an implied ongoing threat to Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 name <nonprod-asurion.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/*

**Ada L. Redondo Aguilera**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 11, 2025