

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Insight Global, LLC v. Aubrey Fisher
Case No. D2025-2695

1. The Parties

Complainant is Insight Global, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Troutman Pepper Locke LLP, United States.

Respondent is Aubrey Fisher, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <iinsightglobal.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 8, 2025. On July 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 9, 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 (Namecheap, Inc. / Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 10, 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 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 31, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on August 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeffrey M. Samuels as the sole panelist in this matter on August 8, 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, Insight Global, LLC, is an international staffing and services company that specializes in sourcing information technology, government, accounting, finance, and engineering professionals and delivering service-based solutions to Fortune 100 clients. Complainant operates out of 60 office locations across 35 states and the District of Columbia in the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, India, and Philippines.

Complainant owns United States trademark registrations for the INSIGHT GLOBAL mark. These registrations are Registration No. 3,630,697 for INSIGHT GLOBAL A STAFFING SERVICES COMPANY, which was registered on June 2, 2009, and Registration No. 4,997,327 for INSIGHTGLOBAL (figurative mark), which was issued on July 12, 2016. Complainant also owns the domain name <insightglobal.com>.

The disputed domain name, <iinsightglobal.com>, was registered on June 10, 2025. It currently resolves to a website that states “This site can’t be reached.” However, at least as of June 19, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a website nearly identical to a recent iteration of Complainant’s website.

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.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the INSIGHT GLOBAL mark. As Complainant points out, the disputed domain name simply includes an additional letter “i” in the word “insight.”

Complainant further contends that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant asserts that it first began use of the INSIGHT GLOBAL mark in 2001, which is well prior to registration of the disputed domain name. Complainant indicates that Respondent is not a licensee of Complainant, nor is it otherwise authorized to use the INSIGHT GLOBAL mark for any purpose. Complainant reports that Respondent does not own any trademark registrations for INSIGHT GLOBAL or ever used the mark before registration of the disputed domain name. Upon information and belief, Complainant maintains that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

With regard to the issue of bad faith registration and use, Complainant contends that “Respondent knowingly registered the Domain Name, a minor misspelling of the Complainant’s unique and inherently distinctive Mark [...] This practice diverts Internet users who misspell Complainant’s mark to a website apparently owned by Respondent for Respondent’s commercial gain. ‘Typosquatting’ has been recognized as evidencing bad faith registration and use [...]”

To further support its contention regarding bad faith registration and use, Complainant notes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website that “brazenly” copied Complainant’s website. According to Complainant, Respondent’s website even incorporated the teal, yellow, and fuchsia circles associated with the INSIGHT GLOBAL brand.

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 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.

This case represents a classic case of typosquatting. The disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's mark in its entirety, simply adding an additional letter "i" in the word "insight." The mark is recognizable 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 1.9.

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 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 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.

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, the Panel notes that Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after Complainant first used its INSIGHT GLOBAL mark and that the disputed domain name constitutes a classic case of typosquatting. Such facts support a determination that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The case file further establishes that the disputed domain name, as recently as June 19, 2025, constituted a nearly identical copy of Complainant's "insightglobal.com" website and incorporated the same color scheme associated with Complainant's brand. As a result, it may be determined that, in using a confusingly similar domain name, Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such site, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website does not avoid a finding of the requisite bad faith under the Policy. In this regard, the Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, that Respondent failed to present any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

The Panel finds that 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 <iinsightglobal.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey M. Samuels/

Jeffrey M. Samuels

Sole Panelist

Date: August 20, 2025