

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Osmose Utilities Services, Inc. v. gdgdg hjhh
Case No. D2026-0680

1. The Parties

Complainant is Osmose Utilities Services, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

Respondent is gdgdg hjhh, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <osmosecareers.com> (the “Domain Name”) 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 17, 2026. That same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. Also on February 17, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Anonymous) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 18, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint that same day.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 22, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Harrie R. Samaras as the sole panelist in this matter on April 2, 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

Complainant is known internationally for utility infrastructure management. It owns numerous registrations for the OSMOSE Mark (or “the Mark”) including United States Trademark Registration No. 2,763,317 (registered on September 16, 2003). Complainant has used the Mark in connection with a specialized suite of professional utility services including: field and technical services for utility owners.

The Domain Name was registered on October 23, 2025. When this proceeding commenced, it resolved to a webpage that appeared to have pay-per-click links (i.e., Finance Application, Bank Apply, Financial Advice). Currently, the Domain Name does not resolve to any website, however Respondent has been using emails that correspond to the Domain Name (e.g., [...]@osmosecareer.com) to recruit or target unsuspecting job seekers offering them nonexistent jobs.

The recruiting emails have been sent generally under Complainant’s name and more specifically under the names and titles of Complainant’s current Human Resource (“HR”) Director and its former manager of Human Resources. Ultimately, during the course of onboarding the job seeker into the position, they are likely asked for sensitive personal information. Complainant has encountered instances of actual confusion whereby mislead job seekers have contacted Complainant to verify whether, for example, the job they have applied for is real and whether they are the job recruiters.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy to transfer the Domain Name. Notably, Complainant contends that the Mark has acquired distinctiveness and it is the primary brand through which Complainant recruits technical experts, engineers and field personnel. The Domain Name incorporates the Mark in its entirety, adding the descriptive term “careers”. It exacerbates confusion by specifically mimicking Complainant’s legitimate HR and recruitment presence leading users to believe the Domain Name is the official portal for employment within Complainant’s specialized utility service sectors.

Respondent has no connection or affiliation with Complainant, is not known by the Domain Name, and is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Domain Name is being used exclusively for a criminal enterprise (described above) consisting of fraudulent job offers, identify theft and phishing for sensitive information.

The Domain Name was registered on October 23, 2025, which correlates with the date fraudulent emails began, evidencing that it was registered with the primary purpose of committing fraud and intentionally attracting users for commercial gain. By impersonating Complainant and its HR professionals and using a confusingly similar Domain Name, Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract job seekers to an online location for financial gain, personal information, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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.

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 entirety of the Mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "careers", 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 Domain Name 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, fraud, phishing/identity theft and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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, it is undisputed that Respondent registered the Domain Name that is confusingly similar to the OSMOSE Mark and in which it has no rights or legitimate interests, many years after the Mark was

registered and used. The Domain Name combines with the OSMOSE Mark the descriptive term “careers” which reflects Complainant’s recruitment functions. As mentioned above, in sending emails to job seekers that replicate the Domain Name and mention Complainant and its human resource professionals as part of their fraudulent hiring scheme, it is clear that Respondent had Complainant in mind when registering the Domain Name. Complainant notes that the Domain Name was registered on October 23, 2025, which correlates with the date fraudulent emails began.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as fraud, phishing/identity theft, passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent’s registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <osmosecareers.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Harrie R. Samaras/

Harrie R. Samaras

Sole Panelist

Date: April 8, 2026