

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

WorkNomads AD v. Benson McGriffin, Fabelco
Case No. D2025-3345

1. The Parties

The Complainant is WorkNomads AD, Bulgaria, represented by Fencer BV, Belgium.

The Respondent is Benson McGriffin, Fabelco, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <worknomeds.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 20, 2025. On August 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 21, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 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 an amended Complaint on the same date.

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 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Gustavo Patricio Giay as the sole panelist in this matter on September 22, 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 operates a global community focused on remote work, coliving, knowledge sharing, and networking, seeking to promote a holistic work-life balance for digital nomads and provide flexible workforce solutions for businesses. Under its philosophy of creating a “nation without a country”, the Complainant enables international professionals to live and work freely by offering remote and project-based work opportunities.

The Complainant is the owner of the trademark WN WORKNOMADS in many jurisdictions, including European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) Reg. No. 018544903, for classes 35, 36, 38, 41, 43, and 45, registered since December 16, 2021; and international registration Reg. No. 1667133, for classes 35, 36, 38, 41, 43, and 45, registered since January 13, 2022.

In April 2025, the Complainant discovered that the work computer of one of its employees had been hacked, resulting in the compromise of this person’s corporate email accounts. Following the breach, several fraudulent emails were sent to the Complainant’s clients, including fake invoices with altered bank details to redirect payments to another account. To make the communications appear legitimate, the hackers copied the Complainant’s CEO and an accountant in the same emails by using the email addresses containing the disputed domain name (e.g., [...])@worknomeds.com) instead of their genuine email addresses end with “worknomads.com”.

The Complainant claims to have online Internet presence through its main domain name <worknomads.com>, registered since July 24, 2014.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 24, 2025 and has been used by the Respondent to send phishing emails impersonating the Complainant’s employees as evidenced by the Complainant in Annex 5 to the Complaint. The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive 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.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark WN WORKNOMADS in which the Complainant has prior rights.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant is not related to the Respondent in any way and has not established any activity and/or business with the Respondent.

More specifically, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has not used and/or has no demonstrable intention to use the disputed domain name except to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. In fact, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to send phishing emails while impersonating Complainant’s employees.

Finally, the Complainant has requested the Panel to issue a decision ordering the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar with a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was 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.

The Panel finds the dominant part of the mark is included in the disputed domain name and therefore 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 omission of the letters "wn" and the typosquatting practice of replacing the letter "a" with the letter "e" in the mark does not prevent the Panel from finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, in line with section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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 Complainant has claimed not to have authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to use the WN WORKNOMADS trademark nor is there any other evidence in the file suggesting that the Respondent has or could have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Likewise, it does not seem that the Respondent is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant has proven in Annex 5 to the Complaint that the disputed domain name was used to send phishing emails impersonating the Complainant's employees, with the purpose of deceiving clients and diverting payments to a fraudulent bank account. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed as phishing, and impersonation/passing off 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 such connection, the Complainant has submitted evidence to support that the trademark WN WORKNOMADS was registered and used several years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. When registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent has targeted the Complainant's trademark WN WORKNOMADS to create confusion among Internet users and benefit from Complainant's reputation. Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant and the Complainant's trademark WN WORKNOMADS when it registered the disputed domain name.

Likewise, the Complainant has proven in Annex 5 to the Complaint that the disputed domain name was used to send phishing emails impersonating the Complainant's employees, with the purpose of deceiving clients and diverting payments to a fraudulent bank account. Clearly, the Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed phishing, and impersonation/passing off, 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.

Therefore, 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 <worknomeds.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gustavo Patricio Giay/

Gustavo Patricio Giay

Sole Panelist

Date: October 6, 2025