

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CoachHub GmbH v. STACY WORDELL

Case No. D2026-1414

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CoachHub GmbH, Germany, represented by JBViniol, Germany.

The Respondent is STACY WORDELL, United States of America (“US”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <coachhubglobalinc.info> and <coachhubgloballeader.info> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 2, 2026. On April 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 2, 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 (Unknown / Privacy User, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 8, 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 April 13, 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 April 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Angelica Lodigiani as the sole panelist in this matter on May 14, 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 German company founded in 2018 providing digital coaching services across a wide range of services through its online platform. The Complainant has entities in the US, Singapore, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, the Netherlands, Italy, Spain, Japan, and Canada. The Complainant employs over 200 people across European Union, North America, Asia, and Australia and works with more than 3,500 business coaches in 90 countries. The Complainant offers digital coaching services to more than 1,000 business clients worldwide, including some prominent and well-known companies.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous COACHHUB word and figurative marks registered in various jurisdictions, among which are the following:

- COACHHUB (word), European Union Trade Mark No. 018135268, filed on October 11, 2019 and registered on May 1, 2021, for goods and services in classes 9, 36, 41, and 42;

- COACHHUB (word), US registration No. 6368150, filed on October 11, 2019 and registered on June 1, 2021, for goods and services in classes 35 and 41.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <coachhub.com>, which resolves to the Complainant's website since 2019.

Both the disputed domain names were registered on March 8, 2026, by an individual apparently located in the US. The disputed domain names do not resolve to an active website. However, they have been referenced in alleged phishing emails sent to unrelated third parties, as further described below.

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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's COACHHUB mark. The latter is recognizable within the disputed domain names and the addition of the descriptive elements "global", "inc" and "leader" cannot prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites and use of a disputed domain name to resolve to a blank or inactive webpage does not represent a bona fide use of the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial fair use of the disputed domain names without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant has been notified by six independent companies that, beginning in January 2026, they received fraudulent communications from individuals identifying themselves as working for the Complainant's sister US company using the title "Senior Accountant & AR Manager, CPA". At that time, the emails were sent from an email unrelated to the Complainant. Following the registration of the two disputed domain names, new email addresses based on the disputed domain names were created and included in the footers of emails and invoices to reinforce the false appearance of acting on behalf of the Complainant. Recipients consistently reported that these domain-based email addresses appeared in signatures, disclaimers, or invoice headers, thereby creating the misleading impression that the communications originated from legitimate personnel of the Complainant. In these emails, the Respondent requested payment or purported outstanding invoices, using language designed to exert pressure on the recipients. The fact that the Respondent used an unrelated email address to send fraudulent emails does not establish any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant analyzed one of the emails sent by the Respondent and determined that it had been sent through a bulk-mailing system using third-party infrastructure, while falsely presenting himself as originating from the Complainant and misappropriating the Complainant's identity. Accordingly, the Respondent intentionally created the appearance of legitimacy, while outsourcing the actual transmission to an external platform with higher deliverability and an established sending reputation.

This technique allows the Respondent to maintain the deceptive disputed domain names while avoiding immediate blacklisting or technical scrutiny that would arise if the disputed domain names were used to send the emails. Newly registered domain names with no established reputation typically trigger heightened anti-abuse controls and are often blocked or placed into spam folders. By contrast, the use of a third-party bulk-mailing service enables the Respondent to evade such safeguards and increase the likelihood that the fraudulent messages will reach their intended recipients.

The Complainant further notes that the Respondent has set up Mail exchanges ("MX records") and Sender Policy Framework ("SPF") records for the disputed domain names, demonstrating intent to use them for email communications.

The Complainant has sent a notice of fraudulent activity to the operators of the third-party bulk-mailing system used by the Respondent and received a response stating that the emails had not been sent intentionally but were the result of a security incident involving unauthorized access to their email service provider. Upon becoming aware of the issue, they implemented various measures to strengthen their security and stop the infringing activity, thereby preventing any further fraudulent email from being sent.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and have been used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, its COACHHUB mark is well known among the relevant public and has acquired an extensive reputation in the regions where the Complainant provides its services. As a result, the COACHHUB mark has become distinctive and exclusively associated with the Complainant. The extensive recognition of the Complainant's mark is further supported by the high number of subscribers and followers on the Complainant's YouTube Channel and LinkedIn page.

In light of the use of the disputed domain names described above, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were registered solely for the purpose of being incorporated into fraudulent email communications, so as to suggest that such emails originate from the Complainant. The disputed domain names impersonate the Complainant, and any email sent from them carries a risk of implied affiliation and is likely to mislead recipients.

The Respondent is clearly acting with a clear intent to misrepresent its identity, infringe on the Complainant's trademark rights, and unlawfully obtain money from third parties. Since March 2026, the Complainant has been made aware of at least five cases of fraud. Victims have been contacted via emails referencing email addresses based on the disputed domain names and induced to pay fraudulent invoices.

The use of the disputed domain names for such illegal activity is evidence of 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 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.

In particular, the Complainant has shown that it is the owner of the trademark COACHHUB registered in various jurisdictions. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 other terms here, "global", "inc" and "leader", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

Accordingly, 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 particular, the Respondent has no business relationship or other form of connection with the Complainant. Moreover, nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names do not resolve to an active website. However, the Complainant has provided evidence showing that they were referenced in phishing emails sent through a third party's bulk-mailing system infrastructure, in conjunction with the name of an individual presenting himself as a "Senior Accountant & AR Manager, CPA" of a sister company of the Complainant. The emails were designed to pressure recipients into paying non-existent outstanding invoices, threatening referral of the accounts to debt collection agencies in the event of non-payment.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were used to reinforce the impression that they belonged to the Complainant and that the contents of the phishing emails were reliable and trustworthy. Accordingly, the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's mark, with the intention of misleading email recipients in order to induce them to make the requested payments.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as, in this case, phishing, passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, 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 was likely aware of the Complainant and its COACHHUB mark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names. The Complainant's mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. Moreover, the Respondent created two email addresses incorporating the disputed domain names, which were referenced in conjunction with the name of an individual purporting to work for a sister company of the Complainant as "Senior Accountant & AR Manager, CPA". It is therefore clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names being fully aware of the Complainant and its COACHHUB mark. The registration of multiple domain names with full knowledge of a third party's trademark rights without rights or legitimate interest constitutes registration in bad faith.

As far as use in bad faith is concerned, the Panel notes that although the disputed domain names did not resolve to an active website, they were incorporated into the text of phishing emails together with other references to the Complainant and to the COACHHUB mark, in order to increase the credibility of those emails by impersonating the Complainant for the Respondent's undue gain.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Moreover, the Respondent has configured MX and SPF records for the disputed domain names, which demonstrates an intention to use them for email communications. In light of the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names as described above, any plausible good faith use of the disputed domain names, whether in email addresses or otherwise, is implausible.

Accordingly, 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 <coachhubglobalinc.info> and <coachhubgloballeader.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angelica Lodigiani/

Angelica Lodigiani

Sole Panelist

Date: May 27, 2026