

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

The Turner Corporation v. Roberthalf, Jiljil Jil  
Case No. D2026-0545

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is The Turner Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Day Pitney LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Roberthalf, Jiljil Jil, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <adminturnertcco.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 9, 2026. On February 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 10, 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 (Unknown) 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 an amended Complaint on February 11, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on March 18, 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 company that has provided commercial construction and construction management services since its founding in 1902.

The Complainant has a portfolio of trade mark registrations for TURNER marks, including the following:

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 2382707 for TURNER in Class 37, registered on September 5, 2000; and
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 6161654 for TURNER in Classes 35, 36, 37, 41 and 42, registered on September 29, 2020.

The disputed domain name <adminturnertcco.com> was registered on November 24, 2025. The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name has been used to operate a pay-per-click page. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name continued to resolve to the same website.

#### **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 disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's TURNER marks. The Complainant argues that its employees exclusively use e-mail addresses featuring the "tcco.com" domain name, "TCCO" being an acronym for "Turner Construction Company".

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the TURNER mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or has undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, as the Complainant further contends, the Respondent has used it to earn pay-per-click revenue. Moreover, the record indicates the Respondent has configured Mail Exchange ("MX") records, a step that suggests the Respondent is preparing to use the disputed domain name in an email address, potentially for misleading or even fraudulent purposes.

The Complainant also claims there is no evidence that the Respondent has any connection to TURNER mark, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name must be in bad faith.

##### **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 Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the TURNER trade marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, the disputed domain name incorporates the term “turner”, which is identical to the Complainant’s TURNER trade marks. The inclusion of the additional term “admin” (which carries the dictionary meaning of “the administration of a business” and is a commonly used title or department name) and “tcco” (used as the Complainant’s longstanding email acronym for “Turner Construction Company”) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the TURNER trade marks and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its marks.

## **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.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade marks and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available records, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file a response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or other legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated or connected with the Complainant in any manner, and the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s TURNER trade marks. The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint and did not provide any information or factors that could potentially establish prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a parking page displaying pay-per-click links does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page containing pay-per-click links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

As such, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainants’ prima facie showing of the Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that none of the circumstances of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy is applicable in this case.

Accordingly, and based on the Panel’s findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

In the present case, the Panel observes that the disputed domain name <adminturnertcco.com>, is composed of the Complainant's TURNER trade marks together with the term "admin", which has a dictionary meaning of "the administration of a business" and is a department or function in many companies, and "tcco", which is the Complainant's longstanding email acronym.

The Panel finds that the registration of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's TURNER trade mark together with additional elements directly related to the Complainant's business, indicates the Respondent's clear awareness of the Complainant and its trade mark rights. Regarding the question of whether the Respondent acted in bad faith at the time of registration, the Respondent appears to be trading on the goodwill of the Complainant's trade mark. The Panel finds by using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website with pay-per-click links related to the Complainant's business, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark, which constitutes bad faith for purposes of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Complainant has provided evidence that MX servers associated with the disputed domain name have been configured to allow email to be sent from the disputed domain name, thereby potentially enabling the Respondent to mislead or deceive potential recipients. This suggests the existence of a threat to the Complainants that further supports a finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <adminturnertcco.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Joseph Simone/*

**Joseph Simone**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 31, 2026