

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ansett Aircraft Spares & Services, Inc. v. James Bond
Case No. D2025-5159

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ansett Aircraft Spares & Services, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Roger Doumanian, Attorney at Law, APC, United States.

The Respondent is James Bond, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ansett.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 11, 2025. On December 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 11, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 12, 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 December 16, 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 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on January 14, 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

The Complainant is an aircraft support company which offers aircraft spare parts such as airframe parts, consumables, avionics, and engines. The Complainant has been known to its consumers and vendors as “Ansett” and “Ansett Spares” since 1988, and has offices in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. The Complainant owns a trademark registration for ANSETT in the United States: Trademark Registration Number 7,577,096 registered on November 26, 2024.

The Respondent appears to be an individual with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 27, 2025, and It has been used for a fraudulent email scheme.

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 ANSETT mark in which it has rights since the disputed domain name is identical to ANSETT except with an additional “s”.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent in any respect. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent created “@ansett.com” email addresses using names of the Complainant’s actual employees and used the email addresses to send forged invoices to the Complainant’s customers requesting wire/Automated Clearing Housing payments to the Respondent’s own bank accounts.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent intentionally registered the disputed domain name in order to send fake invoices to the Complainant’s customers using email addresses created from the disputed domain name and lure them to send money to the Respondent’s bank account.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark 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, and the only difference is the additional letter “s” in the middle. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

In addition, this could be considered a case of typosquatting as the disputed domain name only differs in terms of an additional, repeated letter, which does not change its appearance or pronunciation. Previous UDRP panels have concluded that a domain name that consists of an intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered confusingly similar to the relevant trademark for the purposes of the first element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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.

The Respondent posed as the Complainant’s employee using an email address generated from the disputed domain name in order to carry out a fraudulent scheme. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity – here, claimed phishing and impersonation/passing off – 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.

In the present case, there is evidence of the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to send a fraudulent email impersonating an employee of the Complainant to one of its customers. There cannot have been legitimate reason for such impersonation. Based on such use, it is clear that the Respondent targeted

the Complainant in registering the disputed domain name, and in cleverly adding just one letter to the middle of the Complainant's mark to make the disputed domain name appear confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and nearly identical to the Complainant's own domain name <ansett.com>.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity - here, claimed phishing and impersonation/passing off - constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <ansett.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026