

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TMII ENTERPRISES, LLC, dba A1 Garage Door Service v. Mor Musseri,
Alliance Movers Group LLC
Case No. D2025-4390

1. The Parties

Complainant is TMII ENTERPRISES, LLC, dba A1 Garage Door Service, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by Foley & Lardner, United States.

Respondent is Mor Musseri, Alliance Movers Group LLC, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <garagedoorsa1.com> (the "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 October 24, 2025. On October 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On October 27, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent ("REDACTED FOR PRIVACY") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. On October 28, 2025, Complainant requested to amend the Complaint to add the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 18, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on November 21, 2025.

The Center appointed John C. McElwaine as the sole panelist in this matter on December 3, 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 is a Delaware limited liability company in the business of garage door sales, installation, and repair services across the United States. Complainant owns several relevant trademarks, including the following relevant to this matter:

- A1 (stylized), U.S. Reg. No. 5071380, registered November 1, 2016, in Int. Classes 35 and 37;
- A1, U.S. Reg. No. 5245234, registered July 18, 2017, in Int. Class 35;
- A1 FROM DAY 1, U.S. Reg. No. 7579979, registered November 26, 2024, in Int. Class 37; and
- A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE (stylized), U.S. Reg. No. 7746740, registered April 1, 2025, in Int. Class 37.

Complainant has secured unregistered, common-law trademark rights in the United States for its A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE marks, resulting from its continuous, uninterrupted use of the marks since 2007 in conjunction with garage door sales and service. Collectively, Complainant's common law and registered trademark rights are referred to as the "A1 GARAGE DOOR Marks".

The Domain Name was registered on November 12, 2024. Respondent has used the Domain Name to operate a commercial website offering garage door installation and repair services in Florida under the name "A1 Garage Doors." The services promoted on the website compete directly with Complainant's business.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. Complainant emphasizes that it has invested heavily in building the A1 GARAGE DOOR Marks, which have become well-known in the garage door industry through years of use and marketing across multiple states (including Florida).

With respect to the first element of the Policy, Complainant asserts that it has longstanding rights in the "A1" name and mark. Complainant argues that the Domain Name is virtually identical and confusingly similar to Complainant's A1 GARAGE DOOR Marks. The Domain Name incorporates the A1 mark in its entirety and merely adds the generic terms "garage" and "doors" (and a minor pluralization), which refer to Complainant's business. Complainant submits that such additions do not distinguish the Domain Name from Complainant's mark. Instead, Internet users are likely to be confused and assume that Complainant is the source or owner of the Domain Name.

With respect to the second element of the Policy, Complainant claims that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant states that it has never authorized or licensed Respondent to use A1 GARAGE DOOR Marks, and that Respondent is not associated with Complainant in any way. Given the distinctiveness of the A1 GARAGE DOOR Marks, Complainant finds it implausible that Respondent could be commonly known by "GarageDoorsA1" or any similar name. Complainant asserts that Respondent's website is very similar to Complainant's own branding and services, indicating that Respondent is not using the Domain Name for any bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, Respondent's use is intended to mislead the public and divert customers by capitalizing on Complainant's reputation.

With respect to the third element of the Policy, Complainant contends that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. According to Complainant, the only reason Respondent chose a domain name referencing “A1” and “garage doors” was to deceive consumers into believing the site is operated or endorsed by Complainant. Complainant argues that this conduct disrupts Complainant’s business and tarnishes its goodwill. Complainant also asserts that Respondent had actual or constructive knowledge of Complainant’s A1 GARAGE DOOR Marks when registering the Domain Name, given Complainant’s prominence in the field. Further, Respondent’s decision to hide behind a privacy service and the provision of false contact details are cited by Complainant as additional evidence of bad faith. In Complainant’s view, Respondent’s actions demonstrate an intent to confuse customers for commercial gain and to avoid accountability, satisfying the bad-faith requirement of the UDRP.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Even though Respondent has defaulted, paragraph 4 of the Policy requires that, in order to succeed in this UDRP proceeding, Complainant must still prove its assertions with evidence demonstrating:

- (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.

Because of Respondent’s default, the Panel may accept as true the reasonable factual allegations stated within the Complaint and may draw appropriate inferences therefrom. See *St. Tropez Acquisition Co. Limited v. AnonymousSpeech LLC and Global House Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1779](#); *Bjorn Kassoe Andersen v. Direction International*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0605](#); see also paragraph 5(f) of the Rules (“If a Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint”). Having considered the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, the Supplemental Rules, and applicable principles of law, the Panel’s findings on each of the above-cited elements are as follows.

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 Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.7.

Complainant has provided evidence of United States trademark registrations for the A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE Marks. The Domain Name incorporates the entirety of Complainant’s A1 trademark and contains the descriptive terms, “garage doors”, but reproduced in a different order when compared with the Complainant’s A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE trademark, which panels have recognized as confusingly similar for the purpose of UDRP standing. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the Domain Name is confusingly similar to trademarks in which Complainant has valid rights, and the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii), Complainant has the burden of establishing that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant needs to make a prima facie showing on this element, at which point the burden of production shifts to Respondent to present evidence that it has rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. If Respondent has failed to do so, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. See *Vicar Operating, Inc. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Eklin Bot Systems, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1141](#).

In this case, Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized Respondent to use its A1 GARAGE DOOR Marks or to register domain names incorporating this mark. There is no evidence that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name. Respondent's name is "Mor Musseri, Alliance Movers Group LLC."

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 Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy¹ or otherwise. Instead, the record demonstrates that Respondent has engaged in conduct that negates any claim to legitimate interests. Specifically, Respondent has operated a website that impersonates Complainant by adopting similar branding and offering competitive, if not identical services, thereby misleading Internet users into believing there is an affiliation or authorization by Complainant. Such impersonation is inconsistent with bona fide use and constitutes clear evidence of an intent to capitalize on Complainant's reputation. Panels have consistently held that impersonation of a complainant or its business through a domain name and associated website negates any claim to rights or legitimate interests. See *On AG, On Clouds GmbH v. Nguyen Luu, Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf, Vuong Hoang, AN NGUYEN, NEO CORP., and Ngoc Tam Nguyen*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1714](#) ("a [disputed domain name's] use cannot be deemed bona fide if the disputed domain names constitute trademark infringement"), citing *Sai Machine Tools Pvt. Ltd. v. Mr. Sudhir Jaiswal, Shree Sai Extrusion Technik Pvt. Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2560](#) ("bona fide use is predicated on honest adoption of the name" and respondent failed to show such honest adoption; rather, respondent's use was infringing and therefore not bona fide).

Additionally, Respondent's Domain Name registration data and website indicate two different business names, both unrelated to the Domain Name. As evidenced by the website content, the business asserts to be A1 Garage Doors located at 15965 Westpark Lane, Fort Pierce, FL 34945. However, the Domain Name registration data lists the registrant as Alliance Movers Group LLC at 4485 Stirling Road, Unit 208, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33314. Taken together, Respondent's impersonation of Complainant and the unexplained discrepancy in business names and locations demonstrate that Respondent is not likely making a bona fide offering of services, nor is Respondent commonly known by the Domain Name. Instead, Respondent's actions are designed to mislead and divert Internet users for commercial gain.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, Complainant must show that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. A non-exhaustive list of factors constituting bad faith registration and use is set out in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

¹ The Policy, paragraph 4(c), provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which a respondent could demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name: "(i) before any notice to you 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 (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 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."

In this case, the totality of circumstances supports a finding of bad faith. First, with respect to registration, the evidence indicates that Respondent was likely aware of Complainant's A1 Garage Door Service Marks and business when registering the Domain Name. Complainant's brand and operations long predate Respondent's registration, and Complainant has an established presence — including multiple locations and customers — in the same geographic area (central Florida) where Respondent is targeting services. The Domain Name is not a random phrase; rather, it closely aligns with Complainant's trademark and the core of Complainant's business (garage doors). It is implausible that Respondent independently came up with the combination "GarageDoorsA1" without knowledge of Complainant. Moreover, Respondent's subsequent use of the Domain Name (discussed below) — namely, mimicking Complainant's branding on the website — strongly confirms that Respondent knew of Complainant's mark and deliberately targeted it. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2. The Panel therefore finds that the Domain Name was chosen and registered in bad faith, with Complainant's trademark in mind.

With respect to use, the record clearly shows that Respondent has used the Domain Name in bad faith. By resolving the Domain Name to a website that impersonates Complainant's business, Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark. In other words, Respondent is capitalizing on Complainant's name and reputation to divert customers to Respondent's competing service. This conduct falls squarely within the example of bad faith set forth in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Internet users searching for "A1 Garage Door Service" in the Florida area could easily be misled into visiting Respondent's site and doing business with what they believe to be Complainant or an affiliated company. Such exploitation of Complainant's mark to lure customers constitutes bad faith use. *AG, On Clouds GmbH v. Nguyen Luu*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1714](#) ("the Panel's finding not only that the Respondents are infringing the Complainants' trademarks ... also runs afoul of principles articulated in sections 2.4 and 2.5 (including subsections) of the WIPO Overview is dispositive of [the issue of bad faith]").

Furthermore, Respondent's behavior includes additional indicia of bad faith. Respondent likely provided misleading or false contact details in the domain registration by using the name "Alliance Movers Group LLC," which bears no relation to the website's listed operator, its content, or industry, and employed a privacy service to mask its identity. While the use of a privacy service is not inherently indicative of bad faith, in this case, it was accompanied by evidence of impersonation and deception. The intentional concealment of Respondent's true identity through apparently false information supports an inference that Respondent was aware its actions were wrongful and wished to avoid being identified.

Considering all the above facts and circumstances, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith under 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 <garagedoorsa1.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/John C McElwaine/

John C McElwaine

Sole Panelist

Date: December 17, 2025