

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Signature Solar Limited Liability Company v. Carlo Panaccione  
Case No. D2026-0166

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Signature Solar Limited Liability Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Carlo Panaccione, Carlo Panaccione, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <signaturesolarpro.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 15, 2026. On January 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 16, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Service by onamae.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 16, 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 amended Complaint on January 16, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent's default on February 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on February 17, 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 company established in 2019 in Texas, United States, that markets products and services related to solar power. It is the proprietor of United States Trademark Registration No. 7547189 for SIGNATURE SOLAR (word mark), registered on October 29, 2024, for services in class 35, claiming a date of first use in 2020.

The Complainant operates its primary business website at the domain name <signaturesolar.com>. Its mark and logo are displayed on this website.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 30, 2025. At the time of the Complaint and of this Decision, it resolved to a website purporting to offer solar batteries and panels for sale at discounted prices. The "About Us" page states "Signature Solar is your trusted partner in achieving energy independence and taking control of your power." The Respondent's home page displays the Complainant's logo.

The record indicates that the Complainant notified the hosting provider of the Respondent's website in November 2025.

#### **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 it operates in three locations in the United States with over 200 employees, providing certified design and installation services of solar energy systems, and also selling related products. The Complainant has promoted its mark and logo on various social media platforms, and the mark has become renown within the renewable energy sector. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's SIGNATURE SOLAR mark, with the addition of the term "pro," which strengthens the association with the Complainant, which uses only professionally certified installers. The Respondent has no rights in the SIGNATURE SOLAR mark and is not known by that name. The Respondent's website displays the Complainant's mark and logo and other indicia to create the impression of affiliation with the Complainant. Following the Complainant's report of trademark abuse to the hosting provider, the Respondent changed hosting providers to maintain its fraudulent activity. The Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct by registering other domain names that reflect third-party brands and has thereby been the subject of UDRP proceedings.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

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

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

### **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 ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The entirety of the SIGNATURE SOLAR mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term (here, "pro") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 3.1](#), 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 Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant's SIGNATURE SOLAR mark together with the descriptive term "pro." The Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The record indicates that the Respondent's website reflects the Complainant's mark and logo, and purports to offer for sale products of the same type as those offered by the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation/passing off, 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 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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Complainant has operated as SIGNATURE SOLAR since approximately 2020 and registered rights in this mark in 2024. The disputed domain name reflects this mark, followed by a descriptive term, and is nearly identical to the Complainant's domain name (<signaturesolar.com>), thereby implying a link with the Complainant. Together with the use to which the disputed domain name was put, on this record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has provided evidence that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant's mark and logo and purporting to offer for sale the same type of goods. The Respondent's website, indeed, expressly states that it is operated by "Signature Solar," which indicates and asserted link to the Complainant.

The Panel notes the additional indicia of bad faith, including evidence of the Respondent's pattern of registering domain names reflecting third-party trademarks ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2) and the Respondent's apparent migration to a new hosting provider following the Complainant's notice of potential trademark abuse.

The Respondent has not attempted to provide a good-faith explanation for such conduct and the Panel does not find it credible that one could exist.

On this record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the 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 name <signaturesolarpro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/*

**Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 18, 2026