

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal v. Harry Moore
Case No. D2025-3967

1. The Parties

Complainant is Universal Services of America, LP d/b/a Allied Universal, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Cozen O'Connor, United States.

Respondent is Harry Moore, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ausfins.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with eNom, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 26, 2025. On September 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On September 30, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email to Complainant on October 1, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar.

The Center verified that 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 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. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on November 4, 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 alleges:

"Established in 1957, Complainant is the world's largest security services company providing proactive security services and cutting-edge technology to deliver evolving, tailored solutions. Through its global organization, Complainant operates in at least 90 countries across the globe, providing its clients the benefit of working with a USD 18 billion company with a workforce of approximately 800,000 employees globally. Complainant is the third largest employer in North America and the seventh largest employer in the world. Through its various global services, Allied Universal aims to serve and safeguard customers, communities, and people. Complainant uses the <aus.com> domain name to advertise its security services."

Complainant holds various trademark registrations with the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"), including: (1) USPTO Reg. No. 5,136,006 for ALLIED UNIVERSAL, registered on February 7, 2017 in connection with, among other things, "Janitorial services; Installation and maintenance of security systems for buildings and premises," "Training services in the field of fire prevention, life-saving techniques, and building safety," "Security services in the nature of security guard services; evaluating and assessing on-site security programs for others," with an August 1, 2016 date of first use in commerce; (2) USPTO Reg. No. 5,136,112 for ALLIED UNIVERSAL SECURITY SERVICES, registered on February 7, 2017 in connection with, among other things, "Training services in the field of fire prevention, life-saving techniques, and building safety," "Security services in the nature of security guard services; evaluating and assessing on-site security programs for others; Property surveillance and security protective services," with an August 1, 2016 date of first use in commerce; and (3) USPTO Reg. No. 7,142,752 for AUS, registered on August 22, 2023 in connection with, among other things, "Remote, adaptive and smart video monitoring systems," "security surveillance robots," "Downloadable software for use in the management, remote viewing, monitoring, programming and controlling of security monitoring device," "Security services in the nature of security guard services; personal security consulting services," "Property surveillance and security protective services, namely, providing executive protection, civil protection, personal security consultation, home security consultation, personal body guarding, control of building environmental access," etc.

The Domain Name was registered on June 12, 2019. The Domain Name resolves to a website featuring the banner: "Allied Universal Security and Financial Services Company," and purporting to offer Warehousing, Air Freight, Ocean Freight, and Road Freight services. Graphically, Respondent's website has a similar look and feel to Complainant's site at the domain name <aus.com>. Respondent's website also states:

"Allied Universal Security and Financial Services offers a host of logistic management services and supply chain solutions. We provide innovative solutions with the best people, processes, and technology. With over 60 years of providing world class service to their customers on the asset side, a need to provide a one stop shop for a 'true customer service logistic solution' was introduced. By adding this dimension to an already dynamic and customer centric asset based provider, we feel we bring a total solution."

According to Complainant, Respondent's website lists physical address which is false and actually corresponds to a metropolitan police station.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel concludes that Complainant has rights in the trademarks AUS and ALLIED UNIVERSAL SECURITY SERVICES through registration demonstrated in the record.

The Panel also concludes that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the AUS mark. The Domain Name entirely incorporates the AUS mark, and adds the letters “fins.” In the Panel’s view, notwithstanding the additional letters, the AUS mark remains recognizable within the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Respondent has not come forward in this proceeding to articulate any bona fide basis for registering the Domain Name, or to dispute the plausible allegations and evidence presented by Complainant.

Respondent’s website boasts that Respondent has been in business for more than 60 years. In the Panel’s experience, a business of such duration would have replied to this UDRP complaint, and would not have listed its physical address as a police station headquarters; the Panel also notes that in the contact us page on the Respondent’s website, there is a map of Stockholm. The “track parcel” link displays the postal address of a retail center in Walnut Creek, California, and a map of Newark and New York City. The “T&C” and “Privacy” links in the footer go nowhere. The Panel also notes that the various social media platform icons in the footer link to the same contact page and do not resolve to any third party site where any information about the Respondent would be expected to be found.

On this undisputed record, the Panel finds that Respondent is not using the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, but is targeting Complainant and its trademarks AUS and ALLIED UNIVERSAL SECURITY SERVICES for illegitimate commercial gain.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, “in particular but without limitation,” are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in “bad faith”:

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on Respondent’s website or location.

The Panel concludes that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. The Panel incorporates here its discussion above in the “Rights or Legitimate Interests” section. The Panel concludes, on this undisputed record and in view of Respondent’s bogus street address on its website, that Respondent’s registration of the Domain Name (including Complainant’s mark AUS) and Respondent’s use of a purported company name “Allied Universal Security and Finance Services Company” (which closely resembles Complainant’s mark ALLIED UNIVESRAL SECURITY SERVICES”) are not mere coincidences. Rather, the Panel finds that Respondent probably had Complainant and its trademarks in mind when registering the Domain Name.

When coupled with the bad faith registration described above, Respondent’s purported offering of services at a commercial website that bears a stylistic resemblance to Complainant’s website constitutes bad faith use within the meaning of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 Domain Name <ausfins.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: November 18, 2025