

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TMII Enterprises, LLC, dba A1 Garage Door Service v. Margarita Salivio,
Mediarigs LLC
Case No. D2026-0034

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Margarita Salivio, Mediarigs LLC, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <a1garagedoorspecialists.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 6, 2026. On January 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 8, 2026, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 8, 2026, 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 January 12, 2026.

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 January 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 3, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on January 8, 2026. However, the Respondent did not file any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on February 5, 2026. The Respondent sent further email communication to the Center on February 15, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on February 6, 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 a United States company providing garage door repair and installation services under the name "A1 Garage Door Service." The Complainant states that it has used the designation "A1" in connection with its services since at least 2007 and operates in multiple locations in the United States, including Las Vegas, Nevada.

The Complainant owns multiple United States trademark registrations incorporating the term "A1" (the "A1 Mark"), including registrations predating the registration of the disputed domain name, such as:

- No. 5071380 - A1 (stylized), registered on November 1, 2016.
- No. 5245234 - A1 (word), registered on July 18, 2017.
- No. 7579979 - A1 FROM DAY 1 (word), registered on November 26, 2024.
- No. 7746740 - A1 Garage Door Service (design/color; disclaimer "GARAGE DOOR SERVICE"), registered on April 1, 2025.

The disputed domain name <a1garagedoorspecialists.com> was registered on February 17, 2023. The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering garage door repair, installation, and maintenance services in Las Vegas, Nevada and surrounding areas, representing itself as "The Original A1 Garage Door Specialists".

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the A1 Mark because it fully incorporates the A1 Mark together with descriptive terms related to the Complainant's business.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its mark and that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to offer competing garage door services.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's rights and is using it intentionally to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent email communications on January 8, 2026 and February 15, 2026 but did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

(i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well established 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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark A1, including by virtue of United States Registration No. 5245234 for the word mark A1, registered on July 18, 2017, which predates the registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

In light of this finding, it is not necessary for the Panel to determine whether the Complainant has established unregistered rights in "A1 Garage Door Services" or to rely on trademark registrations that postdate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name incorporates the A1 Mark in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive terms "garage", "door", and "specialists" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel finds that 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 3.1](#), 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 record reflects that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to offer garage door repair and installation services in Las Vegas, Nevada, which compete with the Complainant's services. The Respondent's website prominently represents itself as "The Original A1 Garage Door Specialists". In the circumstances of this case, such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the A1 Mark as the leading term in the disputed domain name, followed by descriptive terms. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that claims to be "The Original A1 Garage Door Specialists".

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The circumstances of this case indicate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its A1 Mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the A1 Mark in its entirety together with terms directly descriptive of the Complainant's services. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves offers competing garage door services and expressly represents itself as "The Original A1 Garage Door Specialists".

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's A1 Mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. This constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel therefore finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <a1garagedoorspecialists.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: February 20, 2026