

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Influx Inc. v. Waleed Naeem
Case No. D2026-0703

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Influx Inc., United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Waleed Naeem, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <influxbpo.com> 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 19, 2026. On February 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 19, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 20, 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 24, 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 17, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on February 25, 2026. Pursuant to paragraph 6 of the Rules, on March 23, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 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, a company founded in 2013 by Leni Mayo and Michael De Wildt, operates as a provider of on-demand customer support and business process outsourcing (BPO) services for brands and technology companies. Its service offerings include fully managed customer support teams, back-office support, enterprise call center solutions, and technical support, all delivered on a flexible, pay-as-you-go basis and available 24/7 across all time zones. The Complainant operates globally and serves clients ranging from startups to established enterprises, primarily in the SaaS and e-commerce sectors. It operates its principal website at <influx.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of a trademark incorporating the INFLUX mark in the United States under Registration No. 4956316, registered since May 10, 2016, for class 42.

The disputed domain name <influxbpo.com> was registered on September 26, 2023, and was last updated on October 5, 2025.

At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an active website offering customer support services, BPO and outsourcing services, and customer experience solutions. These services are directly competitive with those provided by the Complainant under the INFLUX trademark. The Panel notes that while the website at the disputed domain name offers services identical to those of the Complainant, it does not appear to reproduce the Complainant's logo, typography, or color scheme.

The Respondent is Waleed Naeem, located in Pakistan. The record does not indicate any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, nor does it indicate that the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to register or use any domain name incorporating the INFLUX mark.

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 <influxbpo.com> is confusingly similar to its INFLUX trademark, on which the Complainant has prior rights. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name entirely reproduces its trademark, and that the addition of the term "bpo" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity but rather increases it, given that it directly corresponds to the Complainant's industry.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the INFLUX mark in any manner, and that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant additionally submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that the use of the domain name to offer competing services does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of the Policy.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered more than seven years after the Complainant secured trademark protection, and that the Respondent's combination of the INFLUX

mark with the term "bpo" demonstrates deliberate targeting of the Complainant's business. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to offer directly competing services falls within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and that the use of a privacy service at the time of registration reinforces an inference of bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant requests that the Administrative Panel order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

1. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar with a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
2. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
3. the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The record shows that the Complainant owns a trademark registration for INFLUX in the United States, which predates the registration of the disputed domain name by more than seven years.

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

Disregarding the generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".com", the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's INFLUX trademark in its entirety, followed by the term "bpo", a well-known acronym for "business process outsourcing". Although the addition of this term may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that it does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed 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 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 Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the Respondent holds any trademark or other rights corresponding to it. The available Registrar information identifies the registrant as Waleed Naeem, a name that does not correspond to the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, while the disputed domain name resolves to an active website offering customer support, BPO, and outsourcing services, such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The services offered directly compete with those of the Complainant and are offered under a domain name that reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety. Panels have consistently found that using a domain name incorporating a complainant's mark to offer competing services does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests. The website is clearly commercial in nature, and there is no evidence of any disclaimer, commentary, criticism, or other indication of legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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.

The record shows that the Complainant’s INFLUX trademark has been registered in the United States since May 10, 2016, more than seven years before the registration of the disputed domain name on September 26, 2023. In addition, as a result of the Complainant’s longstanding use of the term "influx", such term has acquired distinctiveness as a source identifier in the customer support and BPO sector. Given the Complainant’s established presence in the customer support and BPO industry under the INFLUX mark, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

The Respondent combined the INFLUX mark in its entirety with the term "bpo", an acronym that directly and specifically corresponds to the Complainant's core business. In the Panel’s view, this combination is sufficiently deliberate and industry-specific to support a finding that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's mark at the time of registration.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to an active website offering customer support, BPO, and customer experience services that directly compete with those of the Complainant. The Panel finds that this conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, in that 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 mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's services. The absence of any disclaimer or differentiation on the Respondent's website further supports this conclusion.

The Panel additionally finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to offer competing services is consistent with paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, as it is apt to disrupt the Complainant's business by diverting potential customers who are likely to associate the disputed domain name with the Complainant.

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 <influxbpo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Iris Quadrio/

Iris Quadrio

Sole Panelist

Date: April 10, 2026