

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc. v. Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd
Case No. D2025-3082

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bjscareers.com> is registered with Above.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 1, 2025. On August 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 7, 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 (Undisclosed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 7, 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 August 7, 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 August 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 31, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on September 3, 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 in the business of operating membership warehouse clubs. The Complainant offers the ability for prospective employees to learn more about available positions and to apply for those positions through pages provided on the Complainant's official website.

The Complainant owns various trademarks that it uses in connection with its business operations, including the mark BJ'S, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration in the United States (United States Reg. No. 1751720, registered on February 9, 1993).

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on March 30, 2009. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to set up a website featuring pay-per-click ("PPC") links, some featuring links that incorporate the Complainant's mark and which redirect to the Complainant's website or to third party websites purporting to facilitate prospective candidates to apply for employment with the Complainant. The record also indicates that the Respondent has made the disputed domain name available for purchase through a third-party marketplace service provider. Additionally, the record shows that the Respondent has set up MX records to be associated with the disputed domain name, indicating that the Respondent may be using the disputed domain name to send or receive email messages.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is 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 name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. 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. *Id.* This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the BJ'S mark by providing evidence of its trademark registration. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the BJ'S mark in its entirety with the term "careers," which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's BJ'S mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. The BJ'S mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Respondent is not commonly known by the BJ'S mark or the disputed domain name, (2) the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the BJ'S mark nor is the Respondent a licensee for the BJ'S mark, and (3) the Respondent has not been using the disputed domain name, prior to any notice of the present dispute, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or made demonstrable preparations to do so. Instead, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to post PPC links and to offer the disputed domain name for sale.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this prima facie showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent's favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the BJ'S mark, which the Complainant has long used and registered. The record supports a finding that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant by incorporating its mark into the disputed domain name and by populating the associated website with PPC links referencing employment opportunities at or related to the Complainant. The use of a privacy service to shield the Respondent's identity further supports a finding of bad faith.

Moreover, the record reflects that the Respondent configured MX records for the disputed domain name, which noting the composition of the disputed domain name, makes the Panel consider that there is a risk that the disputed domain name may be likely used for emails potentially impersonating the Complainant or to otherwise mislead recipients. Such setup, in the context of the overall use and targeting of the Complainant, further support a finding of bad faith.

The Respondent has also offered the disputed domain name for sale, further demonstrating bad faith use in these circumstances. Taken together, these facts indicate that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website linked to the disputed domain name by creating

a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's BJ'S mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or services.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 <bjscareers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2025