

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Impact Networking, LLC v. Epr Contractors Inc, Epr Contractors Inc
Case No. D2025-2834

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Impact Networking, LLC, United States of America ("U.S."), represented by Impact Networking, LLC, U.S.

The Respondent is Epr Contractors Inc, Epr Contractors Inc, U.S.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <Impactmybiz.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") 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 July 17, 2025. On July 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 18, 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 (Registrant Name of LmpactMyBiz.com unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 21, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 21, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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 long-established company engaged in the provision of information technology, cybersecurity, digital transformation, print and marketing services with a national presence in the U.S. The Complainant is the owner of the registered trademark IMPACT (the “Mark”), which has been continuously used in commerce for over twenty (20) years and is protected under numerous trademark registrations in the U.S., including, but not limited to, USPTO Registration Nos: 7109951 and 7109952, both registered on July 18, 2023. The Complainant has operated its primary website at “www.impactmybiz.com” for over seventeen (17) years, offering services, products, and employment opportunities through this platform.

Recently, the Complainant became aware that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on May 24, 2025.

Upon investigation, the Complainant discovered that the Respondent has used the email address “[...]@Impactmybiz.com” associated to the Disputed Domain Name to falsely impersonate two of the Complainant’s actual employees, purporting to represent the Complainant. The Respondent has contacted unsuspecting individuals—many of whom believed they were applying for legitimate employment opportunities at the Complainant’s company—through email addresses associated with the Disputed Domain Name. These communications included fabricated job offers and onboarding documents that request victims to deposit what is, upon information and belief, a fraudulent check, and coerces the victims to “deduct [their] \$500 training incentive payment and use the remaining funds to procure [their] remote workstation equipment from [Respondent’s] accredited vendor”. Upon information and belief, if deposited, the fraudulent check would likely bounce and/or the “remote workstation equipment” that would supposedly be delivered to the victims would never arrive. As a result of the Respondent’s actions, the Complainant has received numerous inquiries and complaints from members of the public who were deceived into believing they were interacting with the Complainant.

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:

1. The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s Mark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s registered trademark IMPACT nearly in its entirety, differing only by using an “l” in place of the “i”, which, particularly when seen in lowercase letters, appear nearly identical to Complainant’s Mark. This obvious or intentional misspelling of the Mark, which constitutes typosquatting, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant’s Mark. Under well-established precedent, the addition or omission of generic terms or punctuation does not dispel the confusing similarity.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, nor has the Complainant authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its Mark or any confusingly similar variant. The Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain and has made no bona fide offering of goods or services under that name. Instead, the Respondent has utilized the Disputed Domain Name solely to perpetrate fraud.

3. The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain and/or unlawful purposes, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark. The use of the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant and fraudulently induce victims into purchasing equipment that, upon information and belief, they would never receive and/or collect sensitive personal information under false pretenses is unequivocally malicious and fraudulent. Specifically, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has represented itself as actual employees of Complainant. While the Respondent has used the actual names of the Complainant's employees to perpetuate fraud, some of the more subtle details, such as the titles and email addresses, are incorrect, further evidencing the Respondent's bad faith conduct.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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.

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 Panel finds 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 1.7. The misspelling of using an "l" instead of an "i" does not negate the confusingly similar nature of the Disputed Domain Name with the Complainant's Mark. [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 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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, phishing, 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 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 the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain and/or unlawful purposes, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark. The use of the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant and fraudulently induce victims into purchasing equipment that, upon information and belief, they would never receive and/or collect sensitive personal information under false pretenses is unequivocally malicious and fraudulent.

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 impersonation/passing off or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <Impactmybiz.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan

Sole Panelist

Date: August 22, 2025