

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

JAS Worldwide Management, Inc. v. Chris MOODY, MASSIVE TRUCKING
INC Bulldog Carrier
Case No. D2026-1745

1. The Parties

Complainant is JAS Worldwide Management, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Bates & Bates LLC, United States.

Respondent is Chris MOODY, MASSIVE TRUCKING INC Bulldog Carrier, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jasforwarding.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 24, 2026. On April 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 25, 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 (Redacted For Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 27, 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 28, 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 proceedings commenced on May 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 21, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on May 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Gregory N. Albright as the sole panelist in this matter on June 1, 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 a global logistics company with over 40 years of experience providing supply chain services. Complainant provides freight transportation, brokerage, storage, and forwarding services in numerous industries, including, but not limited to, aerospace, automotive, chemical, e-commerce, energy solutions, engineering/manufacturing, food & beverage, healthcare, retail & consumer products, and technology. Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions for JAS including:

(1) Reg. No. 6,148,084 for the mark consisting of the capital letters “JAS” in a stylized font, issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on September 8, 2020, (hereafter the “JAS Mark”), and

(2) Reg. No. 3,994,522 for the stylized “jas FORWARDING WORLDWIDE” mark, issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 12, 2011.

Complainant also owns a number of “JAS” domain names, including <jas.com>, registered on October 17, 1994.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 8, 2026. Prior to this proceeding, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that displayed the JAS Mark, stated “Welcome to JAS Worldwide USA,” and described Respondent’s services as including “logistics solutions”. Respondent also used the disputed domain name in connection with a fraudulent email scheme impersonating Complainant using false employee identification.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Complainant focuses on its registered JAS Mark. Complainant contends Respondent’s use of JAS in the disputed domain name, and Respondent’s use of the JAS Mark in Respondent’s linked website content, creates confusing similarity with, and tarnishes and dilutes, Complainant’s marks.

Complainant also asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because Complainant has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use its JAS Mark; Complainant does not have any type of business relationship with Respondent; Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services in connection with the disputed domain name.

In addition, Complainant contends Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Respondent knew, or should have known, that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the JAS Mark, as the disputed domain name incorporates the word element of the JAS Mark in its entirety as the dominant element of the disputed domain name. Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, Complainant asserts, because Respondent is impersonating Complainant in its website content (displaying the JAS Mark and similar trade dress), and has conducted a business email compromise scam by sending emails impersonating Complainant using fabricated employee identities.

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 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 word element of the stylized JAS 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "forwarding") 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 disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 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 disputed domain name. Complainant has also submitted some evidence that Respondent was using the disputed domain name to send emails impersonating Complainant using fabricated employee identities. Such uses can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

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, Respondent registered the disputed domain name in January 2026, many years after the September 8, 2020, issuance of Complainant's registration of the JAS Mark in the United States, where Respondent is located. In addition, the addition of the term "forwarding" to the JAS Mark in the disputed domain name betrays Respondent's intent to reference Complainant's forwarding services, and thus falsely suggest an association between the disputed domain name and Complainant's services. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Panel also finds that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name itself is evidence that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website by Complainant. In addition, the website to which the disputed domain name resolved prior to this proceeding displayed Complainant's JAS Mark and included content falsely suggesting that the website was associated with Complainant's forwarding services. The Complainant also has adduced some evidence that Respondent used the disputed domain name in bad faith in connection with emails impersonating Complainant, using fabricated employee identities. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

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 <jasforwarding.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Gregory N. Albright/

Gregory N. Albright

Sole Panelist

Date: June 10, 2026