

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Construction Skills Certification Scheme Limited v. Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc

Case No. D2025-3803

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Construction Skills Certification Scheme Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Wedlake Bell LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cscs.pro> is registered with Communigal Communications Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 18, 2025. On September 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 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 September 22, 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 September 22, 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 October 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on November 10, 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 responsible for the Construction Skills Certification Scheme (the “Scheme”), which the Complainant managed directly until May 31, 2024, after which it granted a license to a separate entity, CSCS Cards Limited to undertake such work. The Scheme is generally known by the acronym CSCS and operates as a leading competency card scheme for the United Kingdom construction industry. Under the Scheme, United Kingdom construction workers are assessed and certified for occupational competence and health and safety awareness. The Complainant’s commercial activities center on managing and licensing this Scheme and the CSCS brand, including its online presence via the website found at “www.cscs.uk.com”. The Complainant owns the mark CSCS and enjoys the benefits of registration of that mark in a number of jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom (trademark No. 2190060 (certification mark)), registered on January 26, 2001.

According to the Registration Data Access Protocol (“RDAP”) records, the disputed domain name was registered on July 13, 2025. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to redirect users to websites displaying deceptive “Security Alert” messages imitating antivirus software branding, which allegedly lead to malware and questionable promotional content. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name has never hosted legitimate content and appears designed to exploit users and damage the Complainant’s goodwill.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark; 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 3.0](#), section 1.7. This element requires the Panel to consider whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark and 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 CSCS mark by providing evidence of its registrations. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the CSCS mark in its entirety with no additional elements apart from the “.pro” Top-Level Domain. The CSCS mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

Accordingly, 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 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 has no connection with or authorization from the Complainant; (2) the Respondent has not been authorized to use the CSCS mark in any manner; (3) the disputed domain name has not hosted legitimate content and instead redirects users to deceptive malware-related content; and (4) the disputed domain name’s sole function appears to be causing harm to users and the Complainant’s reputation.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this showing. The use of a domain name for illegal activity such as impersonation or spreading malware can never confer rights or legitimate interests. See *Société des Produits Nestlé S.A. v. Great Homes, jobs-nestle.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2911](#); [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In this case, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s CSCS trademark and was registered in 2025, decades after the registration of the Complainant’s CSCS. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent likely registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s CSCS trademark in mind. Moreover, the Complainant provides persuasive evidence that the disputed domain name redirects users to harmful content, including fake security alerts and potentially malware-distributing websites. Such use is a classic example of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4. 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 <cscs.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: November 24, 2025