

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MasTec North America, Inc. v. james mafriid

Case No. D2025-4668

1. The Parties

Complainant is MasTec North America, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

Respondent is james mafriid, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mastecincorp.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 11, 2025. On November 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 12, 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 (Redacted for Privacy / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 12, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 14, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on December 11, 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 publicly-traded company based in the United States. For decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered services in construction infrastructure under the mark MASTEC. Complainant owns several trademark registrations for its MASTEC mark in the United States, where Respondent lists an address of record. These registrations include United States Registration No. 2,130,081 (registered January 20, 1998).

The disputed domain name was registered on January 26, 2025. The disputed domain name is not currently linked to an active website. Respondent nevertheless has no affiliation with Complainant, nor any license to use its marks.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns common-law rights to the MASTEC mark "dating back over 80 years," resulting in Complainant's renown as a "a leading national infrastructure construction company" in the United States. Complainant also contends that it owns the registrations for several domain names that incorporate its MASTEC mark including <mastecinc.com> as well as <mastec.com>, which Complainant uses to communicate with consumers online about its extensive array of construction infrastructure services.

Complainant contends that Respondent has incorporated Complainant's MASTEC mark into the disputed domain name, with only the addition of the terms "inc" and "corp," which consumers will likely understand as referencing Complainant's corporate business. Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, having simply acquired the disputed domain name for Respondent's own commercial gain.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, MASTEC, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Although the addition of other terms (here, the terms "inc" and "corp") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term/s does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

Complainant has established rights to the mark incorporated in the disputed domain name, and Respondent has not responded with any valid claim to use the mark. The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s decision, the disputed domain name is not currently linked to an active website. It is nevertheless well established that having a passive website does not necessarily shield a respondent from a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3, which notes that the “non-use of a domain name” does not necessarily negate a finding of bad faith.

Rather, a panel must examine “the totality of the circumstances,” including, for example, whether a complainant has a well-known trademark, and whether a respondent conceals his/her identity and/or replies to the complaint. Respondent here used a privacy service and did not respond to the Complainant’s allegations in this proceeding. Complainant has established prior rights in the MASTEC mark, as well as a strong presence in the United States, where Respondent lists an address of record. Thus, given the apparent distinctiveness and reputation of Complainant’s mark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <mastecincorp.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025