

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Keller Group plc v. Account Receivable  
Case No. D2026-0264

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Keller Group plc, United Kingdom, represented by Barker Brettell LLP, United Kingdom (“UK”).

The Respondent is Account Receivable, United States of America (“US”).

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

The disputed domain name <kellers-na.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 22, 2026. On January 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 27, 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 (The Registrant of the disputed domain name) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 28, 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 31, 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 February 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on March 9, 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 states that it is a company established in the year 1860 and is one of the world's largest independent ground engineering contractors, providing technically advanced and cost-effective foundation, retention and soil treatment solutions.

The Complainant has operations in more than 40 countries across six continents. The Complainant has used the trademark KELLER since 1860 and through the use made of it, has acquired a substantial reputation in the trademark KELLER.

The Complainant states that it has unregistered rights in the KELLER trademark, which date back to 1860.

The Complainant owns a worldwide portfolio of trademark registrations for KELLER including:

- UK trademark registration No. UK3190599, which was filed for on October 11, 2016, registered on March 17, 2017, and covers goods and services in classes 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 12, 17, 19, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 and 45;
- European Union designation for international trademark registration No. 1413014 KELLER which was filed for on July 18, 2017, registered on July 18, 2017, and cover goods and services in classes 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 12, 17, 19, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 and 45; and
- US registration No. 5809069 which was filed for on July 18, 2017, registered on July 23, 2019, and covers goods and services in classes 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 12, 17, 19, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42 and 45.

The Complainant has active web pages at the domain names <www.keller.com> and <keller-na.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 8, 2025. It resolves to a static page of the Registrar. The Complainant provides evidence that the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate the Complainant's North American accounts team, who use the domain name <keller-na.com>, in order to provide a fraudulent mailing address to impersonate the Complainant.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the 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 terms here, the letter “s” followed by a hyphen and letters “na”, may bear on 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 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 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.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed phishing/impersonation, 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 must have been aware of the existence of the Complainant and its activity;
- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark KELLER and the domain name <keller-na.com> of the Complainant;
- the Complainant’s KELLER trademark, domain names, and corporate name predate the registration of the disputed domain name; and
- the Respondent is allegedly using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant for fraud purposes.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed phishing/impersonation, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <kellers-na.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Pablo A. Palazzi/*

**Pablo A. Palazzi**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 16, 2026