

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Exactlogix, Inc. v. the goat
Case No. D2026-1582

1. The Parties

Complainant is Exactlogix, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by WilliamsMcCarthy LLP, United States.

Respondent is the goat, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <accullynx.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 14, 2026. On April 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 16, 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 named Respondent (The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 16, 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 on April 16, 2026, and an amended Complaint on April 22, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on April 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 13, 2026. On April 28, 2026, the Center extended the due date for Response to May 18, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on May 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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, Exactlogix, Inc., is a provider of business management software for roofing contractors. Complainant offers its software products and platform under the name and mark ACCULYNX and owns a trademark registration for that mark in the United States that issued to registration on December 7, 2010 (Registration No. 3,886,987). Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <acculynx.com> for a website concerning Complainant and its ACCULYNX software.

Respondent appears to be based in the state of California, United States. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on June 2, 2025. Respondent does not appear to have used the disputed domain name for an active website or page. The disputed domain name currently resolves to a Registrar generated page that advises the disputed domain name has been suspended.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends it has used the ACCULYNX mark since 1979 and that has acquired substantial recognition and goodwill in the roofing industry software market. Complainant further contends that it also has rights in the ACCULYNX mark by virtue of its incontestable United States registration for the mark.

Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ACCULYNX mark as "the dominant element of the disputed domain name remains immediately recognizable as a misspelling of the ACCULYNX mark".

Complainant asserts that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as Respondent (i) is not licensed or authorized to use the ACCULYNX mark, (ii) is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, (iii) has not used the disputed domain name for an active website and allowed the disputed domain name to be suspended for failing to complete basic verification requirements.

Lastly, Complainant contends that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith given that Complainant's ACCULYNX mark had been in use for sixteen years and is used for a leading roofing software platform. Based on such, Complainant argues that Respondent was likely aware of Complainant and opportunistically registered the disputed domain name, a typo version of Complainant's ACCULYNX mark. Finally, Complainant maintains that "acculynx" has no dictionary meaning, no geographic significance, and no connection to any goods or services other than as a misspelling of Complainant's ACCULYNX.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") at section 1.7. Complainant has provided evidence that it owns a trademark registration for the ACCULYNX mark and that such issued to registration well before Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. *Id.*

Here, the disputed domain name is nothing more than a typo version of the ACCULYNX mark that merely adds an extra letter "l" in ACCULYNX. Such addition of one letter in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity as the ACCULYNX mark is fully recognizable in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's ACCULYNX mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 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 disputed 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 disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name is clearly based on the ACCULYNX mark and does not seem coincidental, particularly as it is an obvious typo version of that mark. Such typosquatting supports a finding that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Needless to say, the disputed domain name as constituted carries a degree of implied affiliation and is likely to be mistakenly seen by consumers as related to Complainant and its software products. Additionally, in view of

Respondent's failure to appear in this proceeding to explain its actions, and the fact that the disputed domain name is currently suspended, further underscore that Respondent likely lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for 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 view of Respondent's actions, and failure to appear in this proceeding, it is easy to infer that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name, which is clearly based on Complainant's ACCULYNX mark has been done opportunistically and in bad faith for the benefit or profit of Respondent. The disputed domain name on its face suggests a connection to Complainant and its products and was registered well after Complainant had established rights in its ACCULYNX mark. Respondent's bad faith is also underscored by Respondent's registration of a typo version of the ACCULYNX mark, a mark that appears to have been coined by Complainant. Lastly, given that the disputed domain name is currently suspended by the registrar and has not been used for almost a year for an active website or page, and given that Respondent has failed to appear to justify its actions, in total suggests that the disputed domain name was more likely than not registered opportunistically by Respondent for Respondent's benefit.

The Panel thus 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 disputed domain name <accullynx.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahitchevansky/

Georges Nahitchevansky

Sole Panelist

Date: May 27, 2026