

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ServiceRocket, Inc. v. Johnson Brave
Case No. D2025-5320

1. The Parties

Complainant is ServiceRocket, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by KXT LAW, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Johnson Brave, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <servicerocketpro.com> and <servicerocketprosupport.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 19, 2025. On December 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 18, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 19, 2026. On the same day, the Center received an email from an email address associated with one of the disputed domain names.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on January 26, 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, ServiceRocket, Inc., is a provider of tech and platform services that assist organizations in becoming more efficient by connecting systems and software and optimizing team productivity. Complainant provides its services and related support under the name and mark SERVICEROCKET and owns two registrations for the mark in the United States (Nos. 4363749 and 5544144, which issued to registration on July 9, 2013 and August 21, 2018 respectively). Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <servicerocket.com> for a website concerning Complainant and its services.

Respondent is based in the United States in the State of Florida and operates a business that offers digital marketing services. Respondent appears to have registered the <servicerocketpro.com> disputed domain name on June 17, 2021 and the <servicerocketprosupport> disputed domain name on January 28, 2022. Respondent also registered in the State of Florida a limited liability company by the name of ServiceRocket PRO, LLC on September 7, 2021.

Respondent has used the disputed domain names for two websites that are part of Respondent's digital marketing business. The website at the <servicerocketpro.com> disputed domain name provides information concerning Complainant and "an all-in-one marketing automation platform" offered by Respondent, and the website at the <servicerocketprosupport.com> disputed domain name is a support portal that provides training and support videos for Respondent's marketing automation platform. Both websites prominently feature a logo with the name "ServiceRocket PRO."

On June 30, 2022, Complainant sent Respondent a demand letter concerning Respondent's use of the name ServiceRocket PRO in the software space and in its ServiceRocket PRO limited liability company name in Florida. On July 30, 2022, Respondent dissolved its ServiceRocket PRO limited liability company in Florida. In that dissolution, Respondent provided a description of the occurrence that resulted in the dissolution as follows:

THE NAME, SERVICEROCKET, IS ALREADY TRADEMARKED BY ANOTHER ENTITY THAT HAS REQUESTED THAT WE DISCONTINUE THE USE OF THE NAME, SERVICEROCKET. WE HAVE REVIEWED THE REQUEST AND AGREE THAT THE NAMES ARE VERY SIMILAR AND THAT WE SHOULD COMPLY.

Following the July 30, 2022 dissolution of the Florida limited liability company, Respondent at some point thereafter apparently continued using the disputed domain names for the above noted websites. On October 17, 2024, Complainant sent Respondent a second demand letter concerning its continued use of the name ServiceRocket PRO. Respondent apparently did not respond to that letter. The disputed domain names currently continue to resolve to the above noted websites.

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 names.

Notably, Complainant contends that it has strong rights in the SERVICEROCKET name and mark by virtue of its United States trademark registrations and its use of the SERVICEROCKET mark in connection with its services since 2012.

Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its SERVICEROCKET mark as they each fully incorporate the SERVICEROCKET mark in its entirety. Complainant also notes that Respondent's statement in its July 30, 2022 dissolution (as noted above) further confirms that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's SERVICEROCKET mark.

Complainant argues that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names as Respondent (i) registered the disputed domain names long after Complainant established rights in the SERVICEROCKET mark, (ii) has conceded in its Florida State dissolution filing that Complainant has superior rights in the SERVICE ROCKET mark and that “it lacks authorization to employ the SERVICEROCKET designation in any form,” (iii) failed to Respond to Complainant’s October 2024 demand letter, (iv) is not making a nominative or fair use of the disputed domain names as they are being used for Respondent’s commercial venture, (v) is not commonly known as SERVICEROCKET or the disputed domain names, and (vi) is not a licensee of or otherwise authorized by Complainant to use the SERVICEROCKET name and mark.

Lastly, Complainant contends that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith as Respondent registered the disputed domain names well after Complainant acquired rights in the SERVICEROCKET mark and has done so in order to attract and divert web users looking for Complainant to Respondent’s business and competing offerings. In that regard, Complainant maintains that Respondent’s digital-marketing services consist of a “wide-range of software, automation, workflow, CRM, and digital marketing services that directly overlap with Complainant’s established technology, software, cloud training, and managed-services offerings.”

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions. On January 19, 2026, however, the Center received an email using the email address []@servicerocketpro.com that simply stated “I’m in the process of transferring my website to a new domain.” No information concerning the identity of the sender was included in the email.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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](#)”) at section 1.7.

Here, Complainant has shown rights in its SERVICEROCKET mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant’s SERVICEROCKET mark as the disputed domain names each fully incorporate the SERVICEROCKET mark. Although the addition of other terms, here the abbreviation “pro” and word “support,” may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The first element of the Policy has thus been established by Complainant.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Upfront, it should be noted that Respondent has itself essentially admitted in its July 2022 dissolution of its Florida State limited liability company that its name ServiceRocket PRO LLC is confusingly similar to Complainant’s SERVICEROCKET name and mark. Given that Respondent has chosen not to appear formally in this proceeding, and likely sent the January 19, 2026 email to the Center advising it was transferring its website to a new domain, Respondent’s own actions undermine any claim that Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. But there is more.

Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names has been to promote Respondent’s digital marketing automation platform and business. While some of the offerings by Respondent do not appear to compete directly with Complainant’s services, they are related to software and technology services. As Complainant uses its SERVICEROCKET mark for wide array of software, technology and support services, it is likely that the use of the disputed domain names and name ServiceRocket PRO on the websites may mistakenly be seen by consumers as related to Complainant and its services and/or a new offering by Complainant. Needless to say, Respondent’s own admissions further confirm that Respondent itself knows this to be likely. As such, it is hard to see how Respondent could have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.3.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for 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 view of Respondent’s actions, its admissions and failure to formally appear in this proceeding, it is more likely than not that Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names have been done opportunistically and in bad faith for the benefit or profit of Respondent. The disputed domain names on their face suggest a connection to Complainant and its SERVICEROCKET services, have been used to attract and redirect consumers to Respondent’s website and business and were registered well after Complainant had established rights in its SERVICEROCKET mark.

Additionally, Respondent’s actions after receiving demand letters from Complainant further confirm Respondent’s bad faith. While Respondent dissolved its Florida limited liability company, Respondent

nevertheless continued to use the disputed domain names and the ServiceRocket PRO name, and when confronted with a second demand letter from Complainant simply ignored such and continued using the disputed domain names for Respondent's commercial benefit. Such actions simply do not support the notion that Respondent has acted in good faith.

The Panel thus finds that 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 names <servicerocketpro.com> and <servicerocketprosupport.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahitchevansky/

Georges Nahitchevansky

Sole Panelist

Date: February 9, 2026