

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Spectra Holdings, LLC v. Benny King
Case No. D2025-3254

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Spectra Holdings, LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Adams and Reese LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Benny King, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <spectra-capital.pro> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 13, 2025. On August 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 17, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 19, 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 19, 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 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on September 23, 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 specialized commercial real estate debt asset management company. The Complainant has been using the SPECTRA CAPITAL mark in connection with capital investment services, funds investment and management services, mortgage lending and financing services, mortgage brokerage services, commercial lending services, and buying and selling of mortgage backed notes since at least as early as April 2023. The Complainant advertises its services through various domain names, including <spectra.holdings>, <spectracapital.com>, and <spectralending.com>, as well as through social media and other advertising and promotional campaigns. The Complainant is headquartered in San Juan, Puerto Rico, and operates three locations in the U.S., and provides investment and financing services to accredited investors and borrowers worldwide.

The Complainant maintains an active social media presence and has established official accounts for SPECTRA CAPITAL on LinkedIn, Instagram, and X (formerly Twitter) to promote the Complainant's services, engage with clients, and reinforce brand recognition.

The Complainant owns SPECTRA CAPITAL trademark under the United States registration No. 97726583, registered on May 21, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 30, 2025 and resolves to a webpage with pay-per-click links leading to services competing with the Complainant. At the time the Complainant detected the disputed domain name, it was directing to a website prominently displaying a logo "Spectra-Capital", and advertising financial investment services relating to cryptocurrencies.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is not the Respondent's name, and the Respondent is not, and has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not and has never been a licensee or franchisee of the Complainant. The Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to register or use the Complainant's trademark or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or in a legitimate noncommercial or fair manner. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to direct to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and advertising financial services, which are directly competing with and closely related to financial services offered by the Complainant. The website appears to be a sham site designed to lend an air of legitimacy to the Respondent's scam, as the content appears to be reproduced directly from the previously existed website that has been linked to various scam

entities. The Respondent also appears to be using the disputed domain name in furtherance of a phishing scam, as the website connected to the disputed domain name includes a “Register” subpage and a “Contact” page collecting sensitive personal information from Internet visitors.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the registration of the Complainant's trademark, the Complainant's domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademark, and the Complainant's extensive use and advertising of its trademark, it is not plausible that the Respondent could have been unaware of the Complainant at the time of the registration. The Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant is further evidenced by the fact that the website advertises investment services and other services identical and closely related to those offered by the Complainant.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to direct to an infringing website advertising services identical and related to those offered by the Complainant constitutes additional evidence of bad faith. The Respondent also appears to be using the disputed domain name in furtherance of an unlawful phishing scam, as it directs to a website collecting sensitive personal information, and the content appears to be reproduced directly from the previously existing website related to scam activities. The Respondent has demonstrated a pattern of conduct indicative of bad faith registration and use of domains incorporating Complainant's trademarks. This is evident from the Respondent's previous use and registration of <spectracapital.live> for similar fraudulent activities.

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 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 a hyphen “-” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of a punctuation 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.

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.

The available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#)).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise agree for use of its prior registered trademarks by the Respondent, thus no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could be reasonably claimed (see, e.g., *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#)).

The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Furthermore, the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website prominently displaying a logo "Spectra-Capital", and advertising competing financial investment services cannot confer any rights or legitimate interest on the Respondent.

The use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising pay-per-click links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. The Panel finds this applies to the present case. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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 registered the disputed domain name reproducing the Complainant's trademark, placed a website providing financial services that compete with the Complainant's services and a website with pay-per-click links. The Panel finds this confirms the Respondent was well aware and targeted the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name, which is bad faith.

According to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: "by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location." By using the disputed domain name to host a pay-per-click parking page and a competing website displaying a logo similar to the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and potentially obtains revenue from this

practice. Under such circumstances the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

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 <spectra-capital.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/

Taras Kyslyy

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2025