

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ledcor Industries v. Jay Paul, Jay
Case No. D2025-4291

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ledcor Industries, Canada, represented by ZeroFox, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S.").

The Respondent is Jay Paul, Jay, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ledcoreca.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 17, 2025. On October 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 24, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 24, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on November 24, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a construction company established in 1947 which operates throughout the United States and Canada. The Complainant operates construction sites for a variety of industries and is responsible for the construction of several landmark buildings such as Vancouver's Shangri-La Hotel. The Complainant has maintained an online presence through their official website at the domain name <ledcor.com>, which was registered in March 1995. The Complainant's legal subsidiary "Ledcor IP Holdings Ltd." has registered trademarks for LEDCOR, such as the U.S. trademark registration number 4192898, registered on August 21, 2012, for services in class 37.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 19, 2025, and it resolves to a website that hosts content that impersonates the Complainant and its official 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's distinctive trademark, as it wholly incorporates the name "Ledcor" with the addition of "eca". The added term "eca" does not create a new or unique term or phrase that can be reasonably distinguished from the Complainant's trademark LEDCOR.

As regards the second element, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name has not been used nor prepared for use for a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name hosts content that impersonates the Complainant and its official website. The impersonation includes the Complainant's logos, links to services and a login page. There is also an active Mail Exchange (MX) record associated with the disputed domain name, indicating that the Respondent has prepared to use the disputed domain name for sending and receiving email communications.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is actively being used in bad faith to impersonate the Complainant. The Respondent has crafted their impersonating site using the Complainant's logos and corporate information. There is a high risk for consumers or employees who mistakenly believe the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant due to the presence of a login page and forms for contacting the domain owner. Moreover, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has a pattern of creating websites impersonating the Complainant, as it has been subject to an earlier UDRP decision for the exact same conduct concerning the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Likewise, paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, provides that "the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence".

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. 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 applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark LEDCOR for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "eca") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

It is the settled view of panels applying the Policy that the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") (here ".com") may be disregarded under the first element test as it is viewed as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. Thus, the Panel disregards the TLD ".com" for the purposes of the confusing similarity test.

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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, according to the unrebutted evidence put forward by the Complainant, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a webpage that is using the Complainant's name and registered trademark, pretending to be the Complainant. Under these circumstances, the Respondent's website cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy, as it intentionally creates confusion with the Complainant, its trademarks, and business. See section 2.13 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel also takes into account the Complainant's allegations that the disputed domain name may be used for phishing or other type of fraud, in view of the Respondent's website inviting Internet users to register, which most likely involves introducing personal data. In this respect, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here claimed impersonation/passing off, phishing, or other fraudulent acts) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Given also the content of the disputed domain name, that includes the Complainant's LEDCOR trademark in its entirety, and therefore carries a risk of user confusion, such use does not confer, in the Panel's view, rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that the Respondent's name, as provided in the Registrar verification, does not correspond to any of the terms in the disputed domain name.

By not replying to the Complainant's contentions, the Respondent has failed to invoke any circumstances which could demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel gives prevalence to the Complainant's affirmation that it has not granted the Respondent any license to use the disputed domain name.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name was registered many years after the Complainant obtained registration of its LEDCOR trademarks. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. The disputed domain name is used for a website impersonating the Complainant, displaying its trademark and logo. Under these circumstances, it is most likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the registration of the disputed domain name and sought to take advantage of it.

As regards the use, according to the unrebutted evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a website displaying the Complainant's name and registered trademark and its logo, impersonating the Complainant, and inviting Internet users to register (likely seeking personal

information). Such unrebutted evidence, the content of the Respondent's website, which intentionally generates confusion and targets the Complainant and its trademarks for commercial gain, the complete absence of any information about the lack of relationship with the Complainant and its trademark, together with the other circumstances of this case, indicate the registration and use in bad faith of the disputed domain name. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or unlawful activities, including impersonation or passing off, phishing, or other type of fraud constitutes bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Also, there appears to be a pattern of abusive registrations by the Respondent, as the unrebutted evidence in the case file shows that the Respondent was involved in at least one previous UDRP proceeding where similar facts caused the concerned UDRP panel to decide in favor of the same Complainant (See *Ledcor Industries v. Jay Paul, Jay*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1081](#)). This fact also supports a finding grounded on paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy, referring to a respondent registering "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 you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct".

Therefore, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

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 <ledcoreca.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: November 27, 2025