

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

G4S Limited v. Extrahostpro Webhosting Case No. D2025-3050

1. The Parties

The Complainant is G4S Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Extrahostpro Webhosting, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <g4sdelivers.live> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 31, 2025. On July 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 31, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 6, 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 August 6, 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 August 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 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 global security company that provides security and facility services in around 90 countries across the world including security solutions, cash solutions, consulting services, care and justice services, and a knowledge-sharing platform named “G4S Academy”.

The Complainant also provides tailored country-specific services across different industry sectors, including courier and logistics-related services and offerings for the sectors of retail and financial institutions.

With headquarters in London, United Kingdom, the Complainant was founded in 1901 and has been operating under its current name, G4S (which is acronym of “Group 4 Securicor”) since 2004, following the merger of Group 4 Falck and Securicor. In 2021, the Complainant was acquired by Allied Universal. With a network of more than 800,000 employees globally, the Complainant is no longer publicly traded and operates under the name G4S Limited.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for G4S, including the following, as per trademark registration certificates submitted in Annex 7 to the Complaint:

- United States trademark registration No. 3378800 for G4S (word mark), filed on October 11, 2005, and registered on February 05, 2008, in international classes 9, 39 and 45;
- European Union trademark registration No. 015263064 for G4S (word mark), filed on March 23, 2016, and registered on September 20, 2016, in classes 6, 36 and 37; and
- International trademark registration No. 885912 for G4S (word mark), registered on October 11, 2005, in classes 1, 5, 6, 9, 16, 35, 36 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44 and 45.

The Complainant is also the owner of domain names incorporating the G4S mark, including <g4s.com>, and used by the Complainant to promote its services under the G4S mark.

The disputed domain name <g4sdelivers.live> was registered on May 31, 2025, and is pointed to a website displaying a G4SDELIVERY logo and promoting logistics, delivery, and transportation services. No disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant is displayed on the website.

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 the trademark G4S in which it has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the descriptive term “delivers” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.live”. The Complainant further submits that the addition of the term “delivers” reinforces the connection to the Complainant, given its security courier operations.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since: i) there is no evidence that the Respondent retains any rights in the G4S mark or any other term used in the disputed domain name and is in no way licensed by the Complainant to use its marks in any way including for the registration of the disputed domain name; ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; iii) the Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as the disputed domain name, incorporating the G4S distinctive mark, is being used to attempt to attract users to a website offering logistics

services competing with the ones of the Complainant, where users can enter tracking numbers and personal information under the impression that the website is affiliated with the Complainant; and iv) the use of the disputed domain name to allegedly advertise services that compete with the Complainant's offerings is not a legitimate, noncommercial, or fair use, as the Respondent is exploiting the Complainant's G4S mark to increase traffic to its website, and likely generates some commercial gain.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that, in view of: i) the Complainant's prior rights in the G4S mark; ii) its high ranking in popular search engines such as Google, where the Complainant is listed in the first result; and iii) the composition of the disputed domain name also containing the word "delivers", strongly suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant, it is highly unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without full knowledge of the Complainant and its services.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor since the Respondent's offerings of logistics services using the Complainant's mark is disrupting the Complainant's operations.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's G4S mark.

The Complainant also states that the presence of MX records in the configuration of the disputed domain name suggests the Respondent has the capability to engage in phishing activity through email distribution, particularly given the implied affiliation with the Complainant due to the inclusion of the Complainant's G4S mark in the disputed domain name.

Lastly, the Complainant states that it sent cease-and-desist notifications to the Respondent on June 5 and 12, 2025, with a view to resolving the matter amicably, and submits that the Respondent's failure to respond further demonstrates the Respondent's bad faith behavior.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall 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 directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is 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 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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of the registration of G4S mark in numerous jurisdictions.

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, such as “delivers” in this case, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

In addition, the gTLD “.live” can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test, being a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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.

According to the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark or the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer that the Respondent has rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website advertising logistics services similar to the ones provided by the Complainant, and that the Respondent’s offerings are promoted under the name “g4sdelivery”, also publishing a “G4SDELIVERY” logo on the top of the home page, whilst no disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant is provided. In view of such use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark.

The Panel also finds that the disputed domain name inherently carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant consisting of the Complainant’s mark and a term “delivers” which could refer to the Complainant’s services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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 finds that, in light of i) the prior registration and use of the trademark G4S by the Complainant, including on the Complainant's website "www.g4s.com"; ii) the Complainant's promotion of the G4S mark globally, and the widespread recognition of G4S services with regard to security and courier-related services for the sectors of retail and financial institutions; iii) the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the G4S mark with the term "delivers" which is descriptive of services offered by the Complainant; and iv) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, promoting logistics services under a name and using a logo encompassing the G4S mark, the Respondent was very likely aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, in view of the contents of the Respondent's website described above, promoting logistics services similar to the ones offered by the Complainant, using a name and logo incorporating the Complainant's mark without publishing any disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <g4sdelivers.live> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: September 25, 2025