

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Glykka LLC v. Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc.  
Case No. D2025-4887

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Glykka LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Scheef & Stone, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc., Cyprus.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <signeasynow.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 24, 2025. On November 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 25, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0174736478, Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0174736478) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 26, 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 November 26, 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 December 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on December 26, 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 was founded in 2010 and provides digital document management applications. The Complainant is particularly known for its application that allows users to share, review, and sign or execute documents, such as agreements.

The Complainant is the owner of the SIGNEASY trademark. Among various United States trademark registrations, the Complainant is the registered owner of the United States Trademark Registration No. 4,376,621, registered on July 30, 2013, for SIGNEASY as a wordmark, covering protection particularly for mobile applications for digitally signing and sending documents as protected in class 9, and indicating a first use in commerce on June 16, 2012.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <signeasy.com>.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Cyprus.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 24, 2025.

According to screenshots provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a website with a phishing alert by antivirus software, stating that the “web page tries to trick visitors into submitting sensitive personal information such as login data or credit card numbers”. At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a website indicating that the disputed domain name is offered for sale.

According to further screenshots provided by the Complainant, a LinkedIn account has been created, using the identifier “SignEasyNow” and allegedly offering “premium digital document signing solutions” with explicit reference to the disputed domain name.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

However, concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel might, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

It is further noted that 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 SIGNEASY trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the SIGNEASY 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 "now", 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 SIGNEASY mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

Even more, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent was apparently well aware of the Complainant and its SIGNEASY trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent has deliberately chosen the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant's SIGNEASY trademark in its entirety, in combination with the rather descriptive term "now" to target the Complainant's trademark and business.

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith. Antivirus software flagged the website linked to the disputed domain name as associated with phishing attempts, indicating that the disputed domain name is being used, or has been intended to be used, for fraudulent or deceptive purposes.

In addition, the Panel notes that a LinkedIn account exists that targets or relates to the Complainant's business and explicitly refers to the disputed domain name. Regardless of whether this account was created directly by the Respondent or by a third party, its mere existence demonstrates that the disputed domain name is being used in a manner that creates a false impression of association with the Complainant.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes 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 <signeasynow.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/  
**Kaya Köklü**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 9, 2026