ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
PowerSecure, Inc. v. Jese Kings
Case No. D2026-0496

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PowerSecure, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Allure Security Technology, Inc., United States.

The Respondent is Jese Kings, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <powerssecure.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 5, 2026. On February 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 9, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 9, 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 February 9, 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 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 4, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton 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 is the owner of the trademark POWERSECURE (the "Mark"), registered in the United States under Registration No. 2851203, with a registration date of June 8, 2004, for electricity generation and related services.

The Complainant operates in the field of distributed energy and backup power solutions and has established substantial goodwill in the Mark through longstanding use since at least February 24, 2004.

The disputed domain name <powerssecure.com> was registered on January 29, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying automatically generated pay-per-click links relating to backup power, generators, solar energy, and electricity services, which correspond to the Complainant's business.

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.

The Complainant asserts that it has rights in the Mark by virtue of its United States trademark registration and longstanding use. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark, as it merely adds an additional letter "s" in the middle of the Mark, which constitutes a minor typographical variation insufficient to avoid confusion.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized to use the Mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant relies on the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a pay-per-click parking page displaying links related to the Complainant's field, and the implausibility of any good faith explanation given the distinctiveness of the Mark, the scope of the Complainant's business operations, and the timing of registration.

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 Panel finds the Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name differs from the Mark only in the addition of the letter "s" after "power," resulting in a minor typographical variation. Such a modification does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Panels have consistently found that the addition, deletion, or substitution of a single letter constitutes typosquatting and does not avoid confusing similarity where the mark remains clearly recognizable.

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 3.0, 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 disputed domain name resolves to a parked page displaying pay-per-click links related to backup power, generators, and energy services, which directly correspond to the Complainant's field of activity. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may evidence registration and use in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Mark had been registered and used for over twenty years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name reproduces the Mark virtually in its entirety with only a minor typographical variation, which strongly supports a finding of targeting.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name further confirms bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a pay-per-click parking page displaying links related to backup power, generators, and energy services, which are directly aligned with the Complainant's business.

This demonstrates that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have consistently found that typosquatting combined with pay-per-click monetization constitutes evidence of bad faith. The Respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for such content, even if generated by a third-party parking service. The Respondent's failure to submit any response further reinforces an inference of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <powerssecure.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/
William F. Hamilton
Sole Panelist
Date: March 24, 2026