

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ComScore, Inc. v. christo leo, leo

Case No. D2025-2622

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ComScore, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Hyland Law PLLC, United States.

The Respondent is christo leo, leo, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names, <comscore.lat>, <comscore.asia>, <comscore.beauty>, <comscore.blog>, <comscore.homes>, <comscore.pics>, <comscore.quest>, <comscore.rocks>, <comscore.wiki>, <comscore.yachts>, <comscore.agency>, <comscore.autos>, <comscore.bar>, <comscore.casino>, <comscore.digital>, <comscore.lol>, <comscore.monster>, <comscore.news>, <comscore.onl>, and <comscore.website>, are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 3, 2025. On July 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 4, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (DOMAIN ADMINISTRATOR) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 9, 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 July 10, 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 July 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 5, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi as the sole panelist in this matter on August 14, 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 Delaware corporation founded in 1999 with its principal place of business located in Reston, Virginia, United States, doing business as a multi-national provider of cross-platform media data analytics.

The Complainant has registered its COMSCORE trademark, such as:

- United States Registration No. 2556866 for COMSCORE, registered on April 2, 2002;
- United States Registration No. 7090764 for COMSCORE, registered on June 27, 2023.

The Complainant uses its COMSCORE trademark in commerce in connection with its provision of business consulting services in the fields of electronic commerce, marketing and advertising on a global computer network; conducting business marketing and advertising research and surveys; computerized database management services; and public opinion polling for business or advertising purposes.

Among twenty disputed domain names in the present case, the order of which is written in section 2 above, the first one was registered on July 4, 2024, the next nine of them were registered on April 19, 2025, and the last ten of them were registered on June 15, 2025. And, although some of the disputed domain names do not resolve an active website, most of them are associated with websites – all substantively identical – that are being used to impersonate the Complainant by using the Complainant's mark and logo. The Respondent has its identity withheld through a privacy service.

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 names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not made any substantive arguments in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant's contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) The disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 names. 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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain names include the Complainant's COMSCORE trademark as a whole. Such fact supports a finding that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's COMSCORE trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Accordingly, 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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant made a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and the Respondent did not come forward with relevant evidence rebutting the *prima facie* case.

Accordingly, 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, in consideration of the fact that the Complainant was founded in 1999, that it first registered the COMSCORE trademark in 2002 and that it has since been using its COMSCORE trademark in commerce in connection with its provision of business consulting services, it is highly unlikely that the Respondent could have been unaware of the Complainant's COMSCORE trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names on July 4, 2024, on April 19, 2025, and on June 15, 2025. Therefore, it is found that the Respondent registered all of the disputed domain names in bad faith.

On the other hand, with regard to the requirement that the disputed domain names are being used in bad faith, most of the disputed domain names are associated with websites that are being used to impersonate the Complainant. Such facts constitute evidence of the Respondent's bad faith use. On the other hand, although some of the disputed domain names do not resolve an active website, according to the panel decisions in previous UDRP cases, such non-use does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. In addition, noting that the Respondent has its identity withheld through a privacy service, it is found that the Respondent uses all of the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Accordingly, 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 names <comscore.lat>, <comscore.asia>, <comscore.beauty>, <comscore.blog>, <comscore.homes>, <comscore.pics>, <comscore.quest>, <comscore.rocks>, <comscore.wiki>, <comscore.yachts>, <comscore.agency>, <comscore.autos>, <comscore.bar>, <comscore.casino>, <comscore.digital>, <comscore.lol>, <comscore.monster>, <comscore.news>, <comscore.onl>, and <comscore.website> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/

Masato Dogauchi

Sole Panelist

Date: August 20, 2025