ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Chainguard, Inc. v. John Do
Case No. D2026-1143

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Chainguard, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Neer McD PLLC, United States.

The Respondent is John Do, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <chainguard.help> (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 March 17, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name that differed from the named Respondent (Privacy User #6679918c, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 20, 2026.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint and the amendment to the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for a response was April 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 14, 2026.

The Center appointed A. Justin Ourso III as the sole panelist in this matter on April 24, 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 Delaware corporation headquartered in Kirkland, Washington, is a leading software security company that sells computer software products and services to help entities secure their software supply chains. It has operated under its CHAINGUARD mark since October 2021.

The Complainant owns United States registration, No. 7,822,411, for its CHAINGUARD trademark, issued on June 10, 2025, for downloadable computer software for the development of containerized computer program applications and for other products in Class 9, for an on-line non-downloadable software platform for use in open source security and application security testing and for other services in Class 42, and for other services in other classes; European Union registration No. 019080488 for CHAINGUARD entered in the register on January 29, 2025, for the same products in Class 9, the same services in Class 42, and other services in another class; and United Kingdom registration No. UK00004101940 for CHAINGUARD, effective as of September 19, 2024, and entered in the register on December 13, 2024, for the same products in Class 9, the same services in Class 42, and other services in another class.

The Complainant owns the domain name <chainguard.dev> and operates its primary website at "www.chainguard.dev."

The Respondent registered the Domain Name on February 12, 2026, using a privacy service, and, within two days, on February 14, 2026, used the Domain Name in an email address, "[...]@chainguard.help," to send an email impersonating a Complainant employee and targeting a third party with a phishing scheme. Prior to the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a landing page with the trademark CHAINGUARD in the Domain Name at the top and featured pay-per-click ("PPC") links to services competitive with the Complainant's services. After the filing of the Complaint, and during the preparation of this Decision, the Domain Name has not resolved to a web page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy to transfer the Domain Name, which it requested.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent, within two days of registering the Domain Name using a privacy service, sent to a third party an email using the Domain Name, fraudulently impersonating an officer of the Complainant, and that the Respondent's landing page featured the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Name at the top and contained PPC links to services competitive with the Complainant's services, passing itself off as the Complainant for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a response.

6. Discussion and Findings

A complainant must prove three elements to obtain relief: (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights; (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and (iii) the respondent registered and is using the domain name in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

On the first element, a complainant must prove that (1) it has rights in a trademark and (2) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to this trademark. Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). The Panel finds that the Complainant's registrations establish its trademark rights. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions 3.1 ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.2.1.

The applicable Top-Level Domain, in this case ".help," is a standard component of domain names and, as such, Panels disregard it under the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1. The Domain Name, therefore, is identical to the trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the first element: the Domain Name is identical to a trademark in which it has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent impersonated the Complainant's Chief Revenue & Customer Officer using the email address "[...]@chainguard.help" to induce a third party into scheduling a sham interview, likely a phishing attempt. In this Panel's view, the deliberate, deceptive use of an email address configured with a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark belies any claim of legitimate interests in a domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.

Also, the Respondent has used the Domain Name to trade on the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark, by attracting Internet users to a web page with PPC links that compete with the Complainant's business, which is not a bona fide commercial use, a noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Name. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 2.5, and 2.9.

Additionally, the Respondent failed to provide any evidence of an actual or a planned bona fide commercial use, a noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Name, or even to respond to the Complaint. On the contrary, the evidence shows impersonation and an intended deceptive use for commercial gain. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the second element: the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the use of the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Name and an impersonating email, the use of the name of an officer of the Complainant in an impersonating email that also included the trademark and the Internet address for the Complainant's primary website, which impersonating email the Respondent sent two days after registering the Domain Name, each is conclusive evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark before the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Panel finds that the Respondent deliberately chose a domain name whose most plausible uses are for deceptive emails targeting the Complainant's business and trading on the Complainant's reputation to entice Internet users to its website for commercial gain.

Promptly after registering the Domain Name, the Respondent impersonated a Complainant employee in a phishing attempt, which is a deceptive and illegitimate activity and a bad faith use of the Domain Name. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.1.4, 3.2.1, and 3.4. The Respondent also used the Domain Name to trade on the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark, by attracting Internet users to a web page with PPC links that competed with the Complainant's business. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.1, 3.1.4 and 3.5.

Additionally, the Respondent used a privacy service, used an incomplete address in its registration data, and failed to submit a response to the Complaint, all of which support a conclusion of bad faith registration and use. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.2.1, 3.6, and 4.3.

These findings compel the Panel's conclusion that the Respondent (1) intentionally registered the Domain Name in bad faith to impersonate the Complainant and target the Complainant's business and (2) used it in bad faith to impersonate the Complainant and to target the Complainant for its own illegitimate commercial gain. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.1, 3.1.4, 3.2.1, and 3.4. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the third element: the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

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 <chainguard.help> be transferred to the Complainant.

/A. Justin Ourso III/
A. Justin Ourso III
Sole Panelist
Date: May 4, 2026