

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

FloQast, Inc. v. FloQast Collections, Floqast
Case No. D2026-0099

1. The Parties

Complainant is FloQast, Inc., United States (“United States”), represented by Pranger Law PC, United States.

Respondent is FloQast Collections, Floqast, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <floqast.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 9, 2026. On January 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 12, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on January 19, 2026, 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 January 22, 2026.

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 January 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 16, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on February 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 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 was founded in 2013. It is based in the United States and provides accounting software as a service ("SAAS").

The disputed domain name was registered December 22, 2025 and resolves to a parking webpage with a multicolored background, the term "flooqast.com" appearing in the middle of the page, and a footer indicating that it will be updated soon. It does not otherwise display active content.

Complainant owns registrations for its FLOQAST service mark, including United States Trademark Registration No. 5141415 (standard characters), registered February 14, 2017 in class 42, and United States Trademark Registration No. 7747963 (mark consisting of a hashtag symbol followed by the word FLOQAST in a stylized font; the letter "F" is partly superimposed over the hashtag symbol), registered April 1, 2025 in class 42.

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.

Complainant avers that it has registered and used the domain name <flooqast.com> for its business operations since 2013, using the FLOQAST marks since that time.

Complainant alleges that Respondent uses the disputed domain name in an illegal phishing scheme. Complainant avers that Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate a named individual in Complainant's collections department. According to annexes to the Complaint, Respondent used the disputed domain name to send instructions via emails to a customer that owed Complainant USD 33,000. The emails attempted to redirect payments away from Complainant's usual receivables bank account to a specified third-party account. Allegedly, the customer alerted Complainant when it noticed that the ongoing written exchange switched from using one of Complainant's legitimate email addresses to an altered email address that inserted the extra letter "l" in the name "flooqast."

Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's marks since Respondent simply added a single character "l" to the disputed domain name, in a typical case of typosquatting.

Complainant also avers that Respondent used false registration details. In those details, Respondent allegedly gave its name as "FloQast Collections," identifying the registrant organization as "Floqast."

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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 a 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, irrespective of the intentional misspelling of the mark by the addition of a letter "l" to the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7 and section 1.9.

The Panel finds that the first element of Policy paragraph 4(a) has been established.

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 that 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.

In this proceeding, the Panel finds that Complainant has provided credible, undisputed evidence that Respondent used the disputed domain name in what appears to be a fraudulent phishing scheme.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that although Respondent used the organization name "Floqast" in registration of the disputed domain name, there is no indication that Respondent is "commonly known" by the disputed domain name in the sense of Policy paragraph 4(d). Quite the opposite, the Panel considers that Respondent likely provided Complainant's name when registering the disputed domain name to use in its impersonation scheme. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed phishing/identity theft or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the second element of Policy paragraph 4(a) 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 unopposed evidence shows that Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate an individual member of Complainant's business, specifically, in its collections department. The evidence shows that Respondent attempted to alter payment instructions sent via emails using the disputed domain name and to redirect to Respondent's own accounts payments from one of Complainant's customers that owed substantial sums to Complainant.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, alleged phishing/identity or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel also finds that Respondent's impersonation of an individual in Complainant's collections department, the use of false registration details, and Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint in this proceeding are further evidence of bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of Policy paragraph 4(a).

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 <flooqast.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/
Jeffrey D. Steinhardt
Sole Panelist
Date: March 10, 2026