

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MeridianLink, Inc. v. kenya qwe
Case No. D2025-2379

1. The Parties

Complainant is MeridianLink, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Thomas Horstemeyer, LLP, United States.

Respondent is kenya qwe, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <meridianlinkcareers.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 16, 2025. On June 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Domain Administrator of PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 18, 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 June 24, 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 June 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on July 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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 publicly traded company providing software solutions for financial institutions and consumer reporting agencies. The company was founded in 1998 and is headquartered in Costa Mesa, California, United States.

Complainant owns United States Trademark Registration No. 3,766,634 for its MERIDIANLINK trademark, registered in Class 42 on March 30, 2010 with a first use in commerce date of June 1, 2001.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 28, 2025 and does not resolve to an active webpage.

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 avers that it was approached by multiple individuals who received emails from an address including the disputed domain name and that Respondent has been using the disputed domain name in an email phishing scheme. Complainant annexes to the Complaint correspondence that includes email announcements of allegedly fake job openings and offers of employment, soliciting the offeree to deposit a check into a personal bank account to purchase office setup equipment from a "verified vendor" as a part of the "on boarding" process for putative offerees.

Complainant also provides evidence that Respondent's New York, New York, United States address specified in the registration for the disputed domain name does not exist.

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, “careers”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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.

The Panel finds that the first element of paragraph 4(a) 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 that 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed phishing, impersonation or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the second element of Policy paragraph 4(a) 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.

The Panel notes that Complainant has provided credible, unopposed evidence that Respondent registered the confusingly similar disputed domain name without authorization from Complainant, the trademark holder, and used the disputed domain name in an elaborate impersonation and phishing scheme.

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 held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed phishing and impersonation) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Under the circumstances, Respondent’s failure to maintain accurate contact details in compliance with the registration agreement and the failure to respond to the Complaint are further indications of bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <meridianlinkcareers.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/

Jeffrey D. Steinhardt

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2025