

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

IPQualityScore, LLC v. dong yan
Case No. D2026-0393

1. The Parties

The Complainant is IPQualityScore, LLC, United States of America, internally represented.

The Respondent is dong yan, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ipquality.org> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 30, 2026. On January 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 30, 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 (John Doe) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 2, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. No amendment to the Complaint was submitted by the deadline of February 7, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Complainant emailed the Center, indicating that it was unable to respond to the Center’s communication of February 2, 2026, due to “unavoidable reasons”, asking that the case proceed “against the respondent as per the original records of the ICANN database.”

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on March 10, 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 has, since 2012, provided intelligent fraud prevention and cybersecurity risk data services under its IPQUALITYSCORE mark. Its core services include a proprietary fraud score for assessing user risk, Internet Protocol Address ("IP address") intelligence to identify proxies and Virtual Private Networks ("VPNs"), device fingerprinting to detect bots and virtual machines, and data validation for email and phone verification.

The Complainant's mark is registered under United States of America Trademark Registration No. 7326163 IPQUALITYSCORE in class 42, having a registration date of March 12, 2024, and a use in commerce date of May 3, 2012.

The Complainant's primary online presence is at the domain name <ipqualityscore.com>, which it has owned since its registration on April 15, 2011.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 29, 2025, and presently resolves to a website entitled "IP Quality Intelligence - Professional network analysis and security assessment platform", ostensibly offering "detailed insights about IP addresses through an intuitive web interface." In addition to IP address analysis of the user's IP address, the website prominently features pay-per-click ("PPC") advertising provided by Google Ads.

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 the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith in order to capitalise on confusion with the Complainant's well-known mark for the Respondent's commercial benefit in offering competing services.

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.

In cases where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable within the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing. Here, the first and dominant feature of the Complainant's IPQUALITYSCORE mark, IPQUALITY, is incorporated 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.

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.

For the reasons discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name in these circumstances cannot represent a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1981](#).

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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's mark for the Respondent's commercial gain, falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel accepts that the Complainant's mark, having been in use for over a decade prior to registration of the disputed domain name, enjoys a reputation within its industry. Internet searches for the Complainant's IPQUALITYSCORE mark return results overwhelmingly relating to the Complainant.¹ The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to this reputed mark, and is used for competing services, which points to bad faith targeting.

¹In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

The Panel has viewed the disputed domain name's website and found numerous references to the Complainant's IPQUALITYSCORE mark on the "About" and "Blog" pages. This shows that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's mark, which is a factor supporting bad faith. *eBay Inc. v. Sunho Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1633](#).

The disputed domain name's website makes prominent use of PPC ads from Google Ads. This contradicts the website's stated purpose of being a "professional" network analysis and security assessment platform. Displaying intrusive PPC advertisements in the manner that the Respondent has is inconsistent with generally accepted standards of professionalism. This contradiction suggests that the disputed domain name's IP address services are a pretext for monetizing confusion with the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant noted that the disputed domain name's website displays a copyright notice claiming "© 2024 IPQuality.org. All rights reserved." Given that the disputed domain name was only registered in 2025, this, too, points to inauthentic, pretextual behaviour.

In the circumstances of this case, the Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent's failure to take part in the present proceeding where an explanation is certainly called for ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3).

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 <ipquality.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: March 16, 2026