

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MasTec North America, Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-5076

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <mastec-civll.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 5, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On December 9, 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, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 10, 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 December 11, 2025.

¹ Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, which includes the name of Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 December 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 4, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on January 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on January 16, 2026. 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 an infrastructure construction company operating mainly throughout the United States across a range of industries. Complainant's activities include the building, installation, maintenance and upgrade of energy, communication and utility infrastructure, including but not limited to: electrical utility transmission and distribution, wind farms, solar farms, other renewable energy, natural gas and petroleum pipeline infrastructure, wireless, wireline, satellite communication, industrial infrastructure and water and sewer systems.

Complainant has been in operation for over 80 years and has been involved in some of the largest and most complex infrastructure construction projects across the United States. MasTec Civil is a division of Complainant that specializes in heavy-civil construction projects, such as roads, bridges, and transportation infrastructure.

Complainant is publicly traded and listed on the New York Stock Exchange as MTZ since 1998. With offices across North America, a workforce of nearly 22,000 professionals

For over 80 years, Complainant has continuously used its MASTEC mark in connection with infrastructure construction services. Complainant also owns and operates the domain <mastec.com> on which it operates its primary website (the "MasTec Website"). Complainant also has a separate website for its MasTec Civil division in connection with the domain name <mastec-civil.com> (the "MasTec Civil Website") which Complainant has owned and operated since 2023.

Complainant owns valid federal trademark registrations for the MASTEC mark in the United States including:

MASTEC (Reg. No. 2130081, registered on January 20, 1998); and
MASTEC and Design (Reg. No. 2544425, registered on March 5, 2002).

The Disputed Domain Name <mastec-civil.com> was registered on July 11, 2025, and resolves to a Registrar parking page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to Complainant's MASTEC mark and simply adds a hyphen and a misspelling of the generic term "civil" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com." Notably, the Disputed Domain Name is nearly identical to Complainant's domain name <mastec-civil.com>, which as discussed above is used to host the MasTec Civil Website, with the only difference being the misspelled "civil." The addition of a misspelling of the term "civil" to Complainant's MASTEC mark does not distinguish the Disputed Domain Name but instead actually increases the likelihood of confusion based on the direct association of the term with Complainant's civil engineering services.

Without Complainant's authorization or consent, Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name which, as discussed above, misappropriates and is confusingly similar to Complainant's MASTEC mark. Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, has not used or prepared to use the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by Complainant to register and/or use the Disputed Domain Name. There is no content posted on the Disputed Domain Name other than a hosting company parking page and Complainant is not aware of any content ever having been posted on the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or consented to Respondent's registration and use of domain names incorporating Complainant's marks, or any confusingly similar variation thereof. To Complainant's knowledge, there are no prior trademark applications or registrations in the name of Respondent for any mark incorporating Complainant's marks anywhere in the world.

At the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name, it is obvious that Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant's MASTEC mark. In fact, Respondent's actual knowledge of Complainant's MASTEC mark is the entire reason behind Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the mere fact that Respondent has registered a domain name that incorporates the trademark of a well-known company is alone sufficient to give rise to an inference of bad faith.

Complainant is not aware of any use of Complainant's MASTEC mark in connection with any services, other than in connection with Complainant. The Disputed Domain Name is so obviously connected with Complainant and its services that its very use by someone with no connection to Complainant suggests opportunistic bad faith.

Complainant sent Respondent a cease-and-desist letter regarding the unlawful registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name on August 4, 2025. Complainant has not received a response from Respondent. A respondent's failure to reply to a cease-and-desist letter further provides that the domain was registered and is being used in bad faith. Additionally, it appears that Respondent has utilized a third party's name when registering the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has demonstrated it has rights in the MASTEC mark. The addition of the term "-civil" which is a misspelling of "civil" does not prevent the MASTEC trademark from being recognizable in the Disputed Domain Name. The gTLD ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a mark in which Complainant has rights.

See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), sections 1.7, 1.8 and 1.11.1, and *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org / Conan Corrigan*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2316](#).

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has presented a *prima facie* case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that Respondent obtained the Disputed Domain Name which incorporates the famous MASTEC mark with the misspelled descriptive term “civl” indicates that Respondent likely sought to piggyback on the mark for illegitimate reasons.

After a complainant has made a *prima facie* case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

Here, Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the MASTEC trademark in its entirety along with the misspelled descriptive term “civl” potentially conveying to unsuspecting Internet users the false belief that any website or email connected to the Disputed Domain Name is associated with Complainant. Such a risk of affiliation or association with Complainant and the MASTEC mark cannot constitute fair use.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting Complainant’s *prima facie* case indicating Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Name was registered decades after the MASTEC mark was first registered and used. The evidence provided by Complainant with respect to the extent of use of its MASTAC mark combined with the additional misspelled term in the Disputed Domain Name and absence of any evidence provided by Respondent to the contrary, is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered, Respondent knew of the MASTEC mark, and knew it had no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel finds that the only plausible basis for registering and using the Disputed Domain Name is for illegitimate and bad faith purposes. In addition, in view of section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the current inactive state of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding particularly noting the reputation of the MASTEC mark, composition of the Disputed Domain Name clearly targeting the MASTEC mark, and lack of response from Respondent.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied 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 <mastec-civll.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/

Colin T. O'Brien

Sole Panelist

Date: January 27, 2026