

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Xerox Corporation v. ISRAEL FRIDMAN, SPENCER & WORTH
Case No. D2026-1985

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Xerox Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Markmonitor Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is ISRAEL FRIDMAN, SPENCER & WORTH, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <xeroxpaper.com> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2026. On May 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 8, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 14, 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 May 14, 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 May 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent’s default on June 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 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 corporation organized under the laws of New York, United States, with its principal office in Connecticut, United States. It is a provider of document technology, printing systems, software and related services with operations around the world. It is the proprietor of numerous trademarks, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 525717 for XEROX (device mark), registered on May 30, 1950 for goods in class 16;
- Canada Trademark Registration No. UCA43818 for XEROX (word mark), registered on September 29, 1952 for goods and services in classes 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 16 and 37.

The Complainant uses the domain name <xerox.com> for its primary business website.

According to the Complaint, the Respondent has previously operated a website offering printing services.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 12, 1999. At the time of filing the Complaint and of this Decision, it resolved to a parking page featuring pay-per-click (“PPC”) advertising related to printing services.

The record indicates that the Complainant sent a notice letter to the Respondent on April 15, 2026. The record does not reflect the Respondent’s reply thereto.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the XEROX brand has been in continuous commercial use for over seventy years and has achieved a high degree of recognition in the United States and internationally. It is a fully invented term. The disputed domain name fully incorporates the Complainant’s mark combined with the term “paper”, which is closely related to the Complainant and its activities. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor does it have any trademark rights incorporating the term XEROX or XEROX PAPER. The disputed domain name is being used for PPC links, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name is a well-known mark combined with a descriptive term directly associated with the Complainant’s products. It has never been used in connection with any apparently legitimate business and no circumstances apply that would render the delay in bringing proceedings relevant.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

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

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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.

The entirety of the 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, “paper”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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 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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name and finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring PPC links related to the Complainant's business. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that such use does not establish rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Complainant established rights in its XEROX mark more than 40 years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, which reflects the XEROX mark in its entirety, together with the descriptive term "paper", further strengthening an implied association with the Complainant's business. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website featuring PPC links related to the Complainant's business is an indication of bad faith use of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5.

The Respondent has provided no evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name, nor does the Panel find any such use plausible.

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 name <xerospaper.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: June 23, 2026