

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Trinity Cyber, Inc. v. Rosemary Hook
Case No. D2026-0522

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Trinity Cyber, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Venable, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Rosemary Hook, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <trinitycybersecurity.info>, <trinitycybersecurity.online>, <trinitycybersecurity.org> are registered with Domain.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 6, 2026. On February 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Perfect Privacy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 11, 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 amendments to the Complaint on February 15 and 18, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendments to 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on February 16, 18, and 26, 2026. As per the Respondent's request on February 18, 2026, the Center confirmed on February 27, 2026 that the Response due date is automatically extended to March 23,

2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal Response, and the Center notified the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment process on March 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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 United States based cybersecurity company that operates a global, subscription-based security platform designed to protect organizations from cyberattacks. They provide this managed cybersecurity service to businesses across various industries to enhance network security and reduce risk.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for the TRINITY CYBER mark, including the following:

- TRINITY CYBER, United States (USPTO) Trademark Registration No. 6254497, registered January 26, 2021, in class 42, for “Software as a service (SAAS) featuring software for protection of computer data, computer systems, and computer functions”, with First Use in Commerce since February 20, 2018;
- TRINITY CYBER, European Union (EUIPO) Trademark Registration No. 019012458, registered August 31, 2024, in class 42.

The Complainant conducts and promotes its cybersecurity business on the Internet through the domain name <trinitycyber.com>, and its website at “www.trinitycyber.com”, since at least 2015.

The Respondent, according to the Registrar’s verification, is located in the United States. All three of the disputed domain names were registered on February 22, 2024. All three of the disputed domain names are being passively held, displaying no content, and contained an identical error message when the Complainant attempted to access them.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s TRINITY CYBER mark and registered domain name <trinitycyber.com> where the Complainant offers and advertises its services. The disputed domain names incorporate the entirety of the TRINITY CYBER mark with the addition of the term “security” and the generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs”) of “.online”, “.info” and “.org”. The word “security” is a generic term that does not eliminate the confusing similarity with the Complainant’s TRINITY CYBER mark since the Complainant offers goods and services related to cybersecurity. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.8. The Respondent is attempting to mislead consumers into believing that the Respondent is related to or affiliated with the Complainant, or that it is authorized to use the TRINITY CYBER mark, when it is not.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent uses the disputed domain names in connection with the bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the disputed domain names. At the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain names, the TRINITY CYBER mark was well known within the cybersecurity industry and among consumers throughout the United States and

elsewhere. The Respondent has not received any license or consent, express or implied, to use the TRINITY CYBER mark in a domain name or in any manner from the Complainant. The disputed domain names are not currently active, and there is no evidence that they have ever been active, despite being registered two years ago. The Respondent has sought to take advantage of and disrupt the goodwill of the Complainant's Mark, such that when consumers try to access websites associated with the disputed domain names, they receive error messages. Consumers would then be confused into thinking that the Complainant has gone out of business. Additionally, there are no circumstances in which the Respondent could legitimately use the disputed domain names without creating a false impression of association with the Complainant.

Lastly, the Complainant avers that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent at a time that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's TRINITY CYBER mark. There is likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's TRINITY CYBER mark and its authorized website at the domain name <trinitycyber.com>. Consumers trying to access websites associated with the disputed domain names would receive error messages and be confused into thinking that the Complainant has gone out of business.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. Rather, the Respondent sent informal emails to the Center and the Complainant's counsel, correcting their address and requesting a four-day extension to submit a Response until March 23, 2026. On February 15, 2026, the Respondent sent an email to the Complainant's counsel stating that "These domains are inactive, have never been used commercially, and have caused no confusion or harm. In the interest of prompt and amicable resolution that avoids the time and expense of a full proceeding for both sides, I am willing to voluntarily transfer all three domains to Trinity Cyber, Inc. I have incurred costs for registration and renewals since acquiring these domains. I would be open to transferring the domains upon reimbursement of my prorated costs for these three plus a modest amount for my full compensation and time to facilitate a quick resolution. To move forward efficiently, could you please let me know what amount Trinity Cyber would be willing to offer in exchange for the immediate transfer and joint notification to WIP to terminate the proceeding?"

Other than the above emails and extension request, there was no additional response from the Respondent.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of its TRINITY CYBER trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the TRINITY CYBER mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of another term, here, "security" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In its email communication to the Complainant, the Respondent has admitted that it has passively held the disputed domain names, and it has not used them for a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Panel notes that the disputed domain names consist of the Complainant’s entire TRINITY CYBER trademark, plus the term “security”, which is a term directly related to the Complainant’s core business in the cybersecurity industry. As such, the disputed domain names give the impression of some sort of a commercial link between the disputed domain names and the Complainant, which clearly does not exist.

UDRP panels have found that where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Respondent has not provided an explanation as to why it needed to rely on the Complainant’s entire TRINITY CYBER trademark to compose the disputed domain names (such as demonstrable preparations for some independent future use) other than to somehow unduly profit from the reputation which the Complainant’s trademark enjoys in the field of cybersecurity. Therefore, the Panel finds no basis to find for any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain names. See *Trinity Cyber, Inc. v. Khorshid Academy, Khorshid*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0519](#).

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 registered the disputed domain names more than three years after the Complainant acquired registered trademark rights in its TRINITY CYBER mark, and more than six years after the Complainant began using its mark in commerce. In its email communication to the Complainant, the Respondent agreed to transfer of the disputed domain names, while asking for payment in excess of its costs. The Respondent did not request any specific amount, nor did it provide any evidence of its costs. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain names in the more than two years since their registrations.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's TRINITY CYBER trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names (which reproduces such trademark entirely plus the term "security" which gives the impression of some sort of commercial link between the disputed domain names and the Complainant which does not exist). This Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Although requesting additional time for filing a Response to the Complaint, the Respondent did not come forward with a formal Response, nor did the Respondent provide any credible rationale for registering the disputed domain names that rely exactly on the Complainant's entire TRINITY CYBER trademark to compose the disputed domain names. The Respondent has agreed to the transfer of the disputed domain names, while also requesting payment of funds. The Panel opines that the Respondent's registrations of the disputed domain names were intended to take unfair advantage of or otherwise abuse the Complainant's reputed trademark, which constitutes bad faith within the meaning of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1; see also *Trinity Cyber, Inc. v. Khorshid Academy, Khorshid*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0519](#).

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 names <trinitycybersecurity.info>, <trinitycybersecurity.online>, and <trinitycybersecurity.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gary Saposnik/

Gary Saposnik

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026