

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Universal Services of America LP v. John Deecon, TrafficDomains INC
Case No. D2025-4243

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Universal Services of America LP, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Morrison & Foerster, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is John Deecon, TrafficDomains INC, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lisa-aus.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 16, 2025. On October 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 16, 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 (Domain Admin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 17, 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 October 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 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 12, 2025.

The Center appointed James Wang as the sole panelist in this matter on November 18, 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 claims to be a leading security and facility services company that has been providing private security services and smart security technology at a global and local level. The Complainant provides its services through security and technology professionals to protect against physical and cyber threats in private, public, and government sectors.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for AUS and LISA, including:

- United States trademark registration No. 7,142,752 for AUS, registered on August 22, 2023; and
- United States trademark registration No. 7,700,045 for LISA, registered on February 25, 2025.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.aus.com” to promote its business since October 1999 and the domain name <aus.com> was registered on July 5, 1994. The Complainant also operates the subdomain <lisa.aus.com> as an employee management tool which hosts an employee login portal.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 1, 2025. At the time of this Decision, the disputed name does not resolve to any active website. It appears from the evidence filed by the Complainant that the website was taken down after the Complainant had contacted the Registrar.

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 confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has provided evidence that the Complainant owns trademark registrations for AUS and LISA.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Therefore, the TLD “.com” shall be disregarded under the confusing similarity test in this case. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.11.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant’s trademarks AUS and LISA. As the trademarks AUS and LISA are recognizable within the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks. The addition of a hyphen into the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

According to the Complaint, the Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the LISA or AUS trademarks, nor is the Respondent a provider of the Complainant’s services. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used or is preparing to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or has made or is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, and the Respondent failed to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Given the facts that the Complainant has long been operating websites at “www.aus.com” and that the disputed domain name simultaneously contains LISA and AUS, both of which are registered trademarks of the Complainant, and is nearly identical to the Complainant’s own subdomain name <lisa.aus.com>, the Respondent most likely registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its LISA and AUS trademarks at the time of the registration. The Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Panel noticed that at the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website. Given the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel believes that the non-use of the disputed domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <lisa-aus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/James Wang/

James Wang

Sole Panelist

Date: December 3, 2025