

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Asurion, LLC v. shataya coleman

Case No. D2025-3656

1. The Parties

Complainant is Asurion, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Adams and Reese LLP, United States.

Respondent is shataya coleman, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <asurioninc.com> (“Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 9, 2025. On September 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 11, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 15, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 17, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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

Complainant offers insurance for smartphones, tablets, and other consumer electronics under the trademark ASURION (hereinafter the "Mark"), for which Complainant has obtained many trademark registrations, including United States Trademark Registration No. 2,698,459 (registered March 18, 2003).

According to the Panel's search, Complainant has operations in 14 countries and 49 offices, 19,000 employees and has served 280 million consumers.

Complainant owns many domain names, but its principal website is "www.asurion.com".

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 22, 2025.

Prior to the filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name directed to a parking page showing pay-per-click links advertising insurance services. The subdomain <email.asurioninc.com> directed to a login page which required an email address and password to access.

Mail Exchange (MX) servers have been set, thereby enabling email functionality.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that Complainant's website at "www.asurion.com" receives over 7.9 million visits annually, and Complainant's website at "www.phoneclaim.com" (which also displays the Mark) receives approximately 40 million visitors per year. Complainant maintains a social media presence, with nearly one million Facebook "likes" and more than 25,100 X (formerly Twitter) followers.

Complainant argues that the Mark is well known, and that prior UDRP decisions have so held. See, e.g., *Asurion, LLC v. Cindy Willis*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2643](#) (finds the Mark "inherently distinctive – and well-known ..."); *Asurion, LLC v. Colours Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0388](#) (finds the Mark "well-known throughout the world").

Complainant also argues that Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to redirect Internet users and Complainant's employees to a false login page incorporating the Mark in the email field through the subdomain associated with the Disputed Domain Name, thereby giving the false impression of an association with Complainant and deceiving Complainant's employees into entering.

Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent has provided incomplete contact details in registering the Disputed Domain Name. The Notice of Registrant Information lists both “Registrant Address1” and “Registrant City” as “Not Requested.”

B. Respondent

Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Mark is reproduced and recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of “inc” 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. 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 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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

“Applying UDRP paragraph 4(c), panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC 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.” [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

Complainant offers un rebutted evidence that Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to redirect Internet users and Complainant's employees to a false login page incorporating the Mark in the email field through the subdomain associated with the Disputed Domain Name, thereby giving the false impression of an association with Complainant and thereby possibly deceiving Complainant's employees into entering their login credentials. Panels have held that the use of a domain name to impersonate Complainant 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 finds that that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Like prior panels, the Panel finds, based on the un rebutted evidence, that the Mark is well known and that it is probable that Respondent was targeting Complainant when she registered the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel also finds that Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Respondent has used the subdomain associated with the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate Complainant to induce Internet users to reveal login credentials. Panels have held that the use of a domain name to impersonate Complainant constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Respondent has also displayed pay-per-click links to competitive websites, which display violates the Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5.

The Panel finds that 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 <asurioninc.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: November 3, 2025.