

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Equifax Inc. v. Hanna El Hinn, euqifax.com
Case No. D2025-3121

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Equifax Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Hanna El Hinn, euqifax.com, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <euqifax.com> is registered with eNom, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 6, 2025. On August 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 6, 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 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 8, 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 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Charles Gielen as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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

The relevant facts can be summarized as follows.

The Complainant is a global provider of information solutions and human resources business process automation and outsourcing services for businesses, governments and consumers. The Complainant operates or has investments in 22 countries in North America, Central and South America, Europe, and the Asia Pacific region. The Complainant is a member of Standard & Poor's 500 Index, and its common stock is traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol EFX. The Complainant employs approximately 14,700 people worldwide.

The Complainant owns at least 221 trade marks which consist of or include the word EQUIFAX in at least 56 jurisdictions around the world (see for example United States Trademark Registration No. 1027544, registered on December 16, 1975, in respect of services in class 36, United States Trademark Registration No. 1045574, registered on August 3, 1976, in respect of services in class 35 and United States Trademark Registration No. 1644585, registered on May 14, 1991, in respect of services in classes 35, 36 and 42). These trade marks are referred to as the EQUIFAX trade mark in this decision.

The Complainant's principal website is linked to the domain name <equifax.com> which was registered on February 21, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 28, 2002 and does not resolve to an active 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 EQUIFAX trade mark because it contains the EQUIFAX trade mark in its entirety, simply transposing the letters "q" and "u". The Complainant refers to earlier Panel decisions concerning the EQUIFAX trade mark in which it was found that domain names containing the EQUIFAX trade mark with two letters transposed are confusingly similar to the EQUIFAX trade mark. See, e.g., *Equifax Inc. v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4321](#) (<equafix.com>); *Equifax Inc. v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1982](#) (<equfaix.com>); and *Equifax Inc. v. Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3929](#) (<equiafx.com>).

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the EQUIFAX trade mark in any manner. Also, by failing to use the disputed domain name in connection with an active website, the Respondent clearly has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and, therefore, cannot establish rights or legitimate interests pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. To the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and has never acquired any trade mark or service mark rights in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Respondent cannot establish rights or legitimate interests pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. First, the Complainant contends that the Complainant's trade mark is well-known in several jurisdictions in the world. It is registered in 56 jurisdictions and is in use since at least 50 years. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent would have been unaware of the EQUIFAX trade mark of the Complainant. Secondly, bad faith follows from the application of the passive holding doctrine, as set out in WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 3.3. Several factors result in this conclusion. First of all, the EQUIFAX trade mark is very distinctive and has a strong reputation, given that it has been registered for 50 years, is protected by at least 221 trade mark registrations in at least 56 jurisdictions worldwide and is used by a public company that employs approximately 14,700 people in 22 countries. Secondly, the Respondent's identity is concealed in the Whois record as REDACTED FOR PRIVACY. Thirdly, it is impossible to identify any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. Fourthly, the bad faith follows from the fact that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy by registering not only the disputed domain name but also other domain names confusingly similar to both the Complainant's EQUIFAX trade mark as well as third party trade marks. In this context, the Complainant, in the amended complaint and after having been informed about the true identity of the Respondent, referred to the following cases:

- *Equifax Inc. v. Hanna El Hinn, Dot Liban*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3492](#) (transfer of <equifx.com>)
- *Equifax Inc. v. Hanna El Hinn*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0914](#) (transfer of <rquifax.com>)
- *Hotwire, Inc. v. Hanna El Hinn, Dot Liban*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2082](#) (transfer of <otwire.com>)
- *Expedia, Inc. v. Ixpedia.Com (Hanna El Hinn dba Dot Liban dba Ixpedia.Com)*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0900](#) (transfer of <ixpedia.com>)
- *Expedia, Inc. v. Dot Liban, Hanna El Hinn*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0433](#) (transfer of <expedioa.com>, <expediua.com>, <expedoia.com>, <expeduia.com> and <exped8a.com>).

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only difference is that the letters "q" and "u" are transposed which has no effect on the overall similarity between the EQUIFAX trade mark and the disputed domain name. This difference does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the trade mark and 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](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9. The disputed domain name is a clear example of typo squatting.

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.

First, the Respondent did not show that it owns any rights to the name “euqifax” nor that it has any license from the Complainant to use its EQUIFAX trade mark. Second, apart from listing in the registration records for the disputed domain name its organization as “euqifax.com”, the Respondent did not argue that it is commonly known, or that it has ever been known under the name “euqifax”. Furthermore, the Panel did not find any evidence that the Respondent has used, or prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the disputed domain name does not direct to an active website.

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.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes first of all the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trade mark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, clearly indicating that the Respondent had the distinctive and reputed trade mark EQUIFAX in mind at the time of registering the disputed domain name. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name does not direct to an active website showing that the Respondent does not have any intentions of bona fide use. Also, the Panel notes that the Respondent’s bad faith intentions follow from the fact that the Respondent did not file any response. Finally, the Panel notes that the Respondent engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct by registering not only the disputed domain name but also other domain names confusingly similar to both the Complainant’s EQUIFAX trade mark as well as third party trade marks. All these factors result in the finding that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <euqifax.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Charles Gielen/

Charles Gielen

Sole Panelist

Date: September 22, 2025