

## **ADMINISTRATIVE Panel DECISION**

Social Expansion LLC DBA TalentPop v. Jared Orkin  
Case No. D2026-0445

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Social Expansion LLC DBA TalentPop, United States of America (“United States”), represented internally.

Respondent is Jared Orkin, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <talentpop.com> (hereinafter the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 3, 2026. On February 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On February 4, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2026. Respondent requested an automatic extension of the Response on March 6, 2026. On March 9, 2026, the Center confirmed the Response due date was extended to March 15, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on March 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 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.

### **Panel Order**

On April 9, 2026, the Panel issued an Order asking the parties to clarify when the Disputed Domain Name was registered by or transferred to Respondent and to clarify whether either party was related to prior owners of the Disputed Domain Name. Both parties filed timely responses.

## **4. Factual Background**

Complainant provides staffing services to businesses, including staffing for outsourced customer support, executive assistants, and marketing assistants for e-commerce and technology companies. Complainant's customers consist of businesses operating in the e-commerce and technology sectors.

Complainant has operated continuously under the TALENTPOP name since April 2020 and has a pending application at the USPTO claiming use in commerce since 2021. Complainant operates its primary website at <talentpop.co>.

Respondent Jared Orkin is Chief Executive Officer of Activate Talent, LLC, which, since 2023, has been in business recruiting and providing remote staffing for e-commerce and digital businesses. Respondent promotes its business via its website at <activatetalent.com>.

On January 20, 2026, Respondent purchased the Disputed Domain Name from GoDaddy.<sup>1</sup> Respondent redirects the Disputed Domain Name to <activatetalent.com>. The term TALENTPOP does not appear in the text displayed on Respondent's <activatetalent.com> website.

## **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.

Notably, with respect to the issue most relevant to the Panel's decision, Complainant alleges that it "operated continuously under the TALENTPOP name since April 2020 and has, over approximately six (6) years, built goodwill, brand recognition, and a commercial presence in its industry". Accordingly, Complainant contends that it owns unregistered common law rights in TALENTPOP as a trademark.

Although not relevant to the issues that are, in the Panel's view, determinative, the Panel acknowledges that Complainant also contends that Respondent is a competitor and that Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith to exploit Complainant's business reputation and cause confusion to attract Internet traffic, which it then redirects to Respondent's competing website.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Disputed Domain Name was originally registered by an unrelated third party in 2001. There is no evidence that Respondent was related to the original registrant.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent contends that Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

With respect to the issue most relevant to the Panel's decision, Respondent contends that Complainant has not offered evidence to support its claim of unregistered rights.

Although not relevant to the determinative issue, the Panel acknowledges that Respondent also contends that:

- "Talent Pop" is descriptive; that both component terms ("Talent" and "Pop") are frequently combined for their descriptive connotations in the recruiting and human resources fields; and that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name because of its descriptiveness.
- There is substantial third-party use of similar trademarks.
- The Complaint alleges trademark dispute between competitors that is outside the scope of the Policy.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has not been established. Although Complainant alleges that it has used TALENTPOP as a trademark since April 2020, and points to Internet Archive screenshots to support this claim, Complainant has not offered any evidence regarding the quantity or scope of this use. This is not sufficient under the Policy. As is explained in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. "specific evidence including for example documented evidence of figures relating to sales, marketing, and/or social media endorsements supporting assertions of acquired distinctiveness should be included in the complaint; conclusory allegations of unregistered or common law rights, even if undisputed in the particular UDRP case, would not normally suffice to show secondary meaning."

Although the Panel finds that Complainant has not submitted sufficient evidence to satisfy the Policy, the Panel does not find that no such rights exist. On the contrary, Complainant's website scrolls the brand names of many prominent companies with which Complainant purports to have done business. Evidence to substantiate and quantify Complainant's relationship with these clients could have helped Complainant support its claim of unregistered trademark rights.

Because Complainant has not satisfied the requirements of Policy paragraph 4(a)(i), the Panel need not address the requirements of Policy paragraphs 4(ii) and 4(a)(iii).

That said, the Panel makes some observations:

While the Respondent asserts that he was unaware of the Complainant, the Panel notes that the Parties are competitors and the disputed domain name is identical to the claimed mark, with the exception of the Top Level Domain.

The majority of the Response is focused on attacking any claim to unregistered trademark rights, for example, the Respondent points to a number of third party uses (including the prior registrant of the disputed domain name) of the term "pop" being used in the talent industry; the Panel has doubts that all of the uses invoked by the Respondent squarely support his case. The Respondent suggests that the disputed domain name is a "common combination" and a dictionary word and also descriptive and laudatory.

The Respondent also suggests that “pop” is an acronym with various meanings and that; while this may be true, it strikes the Panel that the Respondent is offering a number of narratives which are not necessarily aligned, and which cumulatively serve to call into doubt the true registration intentions. The Respondent also mentions a USPTO-registered mark on the Supplemental Register for “POPUP TALENT” with “talent” disclaimed and even goes so far as to suggest that “a registrant has every right to register the most apt and quintessentially descriptive term for its business, even if it is confusingly similar to domain name or trademark”.

While the Panel cannot discount the Respondent’s claim to not have been aware of the Complainant, above all, it is noted that the parties are in the same industry. At the same time, there are sufficient questions concerning the scope of the Complainant’s reputation (which it could have addressed in the Complaint) and the potential strength of its mark – whether eventually registered or not (and whether on the Principal or Supplemental Register) such that the Panel considers this case advanced by the Complainant, at least based on the evidence provided, not capable of reaching a disposition (let alone carrying its burden).

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied without prejudice to the Complainant’s ability to refile.

*/Lawrence K. Nodine/*

**Lawrence K. Nodine**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 29, 2026