

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TMII Enterprises, LLC, (dba A1 Garage Door Service) v. zohar harel
Case No. D2025-5231

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TMII Enterprises, LLC, (dba A1 Garage Door Service), United States of America (“United States”), represented by Foley & Lardner, United States.

The Respondent is zohar harel, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <a1garagedoorexperts.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 15, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 23, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 24, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 29, 2025.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondent sent two email communications to the Center respectively on December 30, 2025, and January 2, 2026. However, the Respondent did not file any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on January 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on January 29, 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, TMII Enterprises, LLC, (dba A1 Garage Door Service), is in the business of providing garage door repair and installation services in the United States. The Complainant operates in multiple locations in the United States, including Orlando, Florida, and surrounding areas.

The Complainant has a portfolio of trade mark registrations incorporating the A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE marks, including the following:

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 5071380 for A1 (stylized) in Classes 35 and 37, registered on November 1, 2016;
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 5245234 for A1 in Class 35, registered on July 18, 2017;
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 7579979 for A1 FROM DAY 1 in Class 37, registered on November 26, 2024; and
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 7746740 for A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE (stylized) in Class 37, registered on April 1, 2025.

The Complainant has continuously operated a website using the domain name <a1garage.com>, where it promotes its garage door sales, repair and installation services under the A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE marks.

The disputed domain name <a1garagedoorexports.com> was registered on August 3, 2025. The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name has been used to operate a website featuring a highly similar A1 figurative mark with the language "GARAGE DOOR EXPERTS" and claiming to provide garage door repair and installation services in and around Orlando, Florida, United States. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an error page.

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 disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE marks.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE marks, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or has undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also claims there is no evidence that the Respondent has any connection to the A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE marks, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name must be in bad faith. The Complainant further indicated that the Respondent was using the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to an imitation website prominently displaying a highly similar A1 mark on its landing page, claiming to offer the Complainant's branded garage

door sales, repair and installation services, thus unfairly trading on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's marks.

The Complainant argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name was in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, but sent two email communications to the Center confirming its consent to the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 trade mark 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 Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE trade marks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", the disputed domain name incorporates the term "a1" which is identical to the Complainant's A1 trade marks and "a1garagedoor" which is identical to the main distinctive element of the Complainant's trade mark A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE. Therefore, the Complainant's A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE marks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. The inclusion of the additional term "experts" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8 and 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE trade marks and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its marks.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or other legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests with 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 other legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or other legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade marks and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available records, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file any formal response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or other legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated or connected with the Complainant in any manner, and the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant's A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE trade marks. The Respondent did not formally respond to the Complaint, and did not provide any information or factors that could potentially establish prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Furthermore, there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has engaged in any legitimate noncommercial or bona fide use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has presented evidence linking the disputed domain name to a website imitating the Complainant, which supports a finding that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves featured an A1 figurative mark that is highly similar to the Complainant's, with the language "GARAGE DOOR EXPERTS", and claimed to provide garage door repair and installation services in and around Orlando, Florida, United States. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests in a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, and based on the Panel's findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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.

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. In the present case, the Panel observes that the disputed domain name <a1garagedoorexperts.com>, is composed of the

Complainant's A1 and the majority of the A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE trade marks together with the term "experts", which describes the Complainant's business activities. This combination provides a more accurate and thorough representation of the Complainant's operations.

The Panel finds that the registration of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's A1 and the majority of the A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE trade mark together with additional elements directly related to the Complainant's business, indicates the Respondent's clear awareness of the Complainant and its trade mark rights. Regarding bad faith at the time of registration, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights in the A1 trade mark and business, as the website at the disputed domain name closely imitated the Complainant's official website.

Moreover, the Complainant has provided evidence that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to imitate the Complainant without authorization. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation constitutes use in bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4). Upon review of the record, the Panel finds that both the registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Respondent has established a website under the disputed domain name falsely presenting itself as the Complainant. Such conduct constitutes evidence of the Respondent's intent to deceive consumers, misappropriate the Complainant's goodwill, and exploit the A1 trade marks for illegitimate purposes.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith pursuant to 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 <a1garagedoorexper.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: February 12, 2026