ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Qgenda, LLC. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-1889

1. The Parties

Complainant is Qgenda, LLC., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hearst, United States.

Respondent is Name Redacted[1], United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <joinqgenda.team> (the "Disputed 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 April 30, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 1, 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 (Privacy User #d76b72f3) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 5, 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 May 6, 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").

[1] Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted Respondent's name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, which includes the name of Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1788.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on June 4, 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 Delaware limited liability company that is a provider of healthcare workforce management software and services operating under the QGENDA Mark. Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

United States Registration No. 4,376,118 for QGENDA registered July 30, 2013; and

United States Registration No. 7,364,691 for QGENDA registered April 23, 2024.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on January 19, 2026, and does not resolve to any active website. However, mail exchange ("MX") servers have been configured in relation to the Disputed Domain Name, allowing for the sending and receiving of email. Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a fraudulent email scheme impersonating the human resources ("HR") department of Complainant, sending emails to individuals purportedly offering job offers and requesting personal information from such individuals including identification documents.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the QGENDA Mark with the addition of the term "join" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".team" extension. Complainant further contends that the addition of such term and gTLD extension does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and, in this case, increases confusion by suggesting employment or affiliation with Complainant.

Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Name is being used in connection with a fraudulent impersonation scheme including the sending of emails purporting to originate from Complainant's HR department recruiting personnel by sending emails purportedly offering job offers, and by attempting to mislead recipients into providing personal or sensitive information. Complainant further contends that Respondent is engaged in unauthorized communications which constitute phishing.

Complainant submits that Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by Complainant to use the QGENDA Mark in the Disputed Domain Name or in any other way.

Complainant further submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant further submits that the fraudulent phishing scheme of Respondent precludes any finding that Respondent has acted in a bona fide or legitimate manner.

Complainant alleges that Respondent's fraudulent impersonation scheme constitutes bad faith. Complainant further alleges that Respondent had actual and constructive knowledge of Complainant's rights in the QGENDA Mark when Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainant's assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainant to verify that the three essential elements of the claims are met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

i) that the Disputed Domain Name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the QGENDA Mark in which Complainant has rights;

ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and

iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1 states that registration of a trademark, here the QGENDA Mark, prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of Complainant having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case.

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.

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 QGENDA Mark and the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the QGENDA Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "join", 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 QGENDA 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy allows three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that Respondent has rights or a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name:

(i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the QGENDA Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed to be fraudulent impersonation and phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1. The use of Complainant's name and the name of Complainant's personnel in the registration of the Disputed Domain Name is further evidence of the illegitimate purpose of the registration.

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 the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainant to show bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name:

(i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the QGENDA Mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; or

(ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the QGENDA Mark from reflecting the QGENDA Mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Disputed Domain Name, you [Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the QGENDA Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product on your website or location.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

One of the additional elements to be considered is whether Respondent knew or should have known about Complainant's rights in the QGENDA Mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3. The Panel finds that Respondent had actual and constructive knowledge of Complainant's rights in the QGENDA Mark. The Panel notes in particular that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, including the entirety of Complainant's QGENDA Mark embedded between the terms "join" and gTLD ".team", which can both be associated with recruitment, creating the phrase "join qgenda team", further supports the conclusion that Respondent was aware of and targeted Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview 3.1 at section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of the Disputed Domain Name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as fraudulent impersonation and phishing, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel 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 <joinqgenda.team> be transferred to Complainant.

/Richard W. Page/
Richard W. Page
Sole Panelist
Date: June 10, 2026