

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ZipRecruiter, Inc. v. Unity Company
Case No. D2026-2006

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ZipRecruiter, Inc., United States of America, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Unity Company, Brazil.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <ziprecruiter-news.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 8, 2026. On May 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 13, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 19, 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 19, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Edward C. Chiasson K.C. as the sole panelist in this matter on June 18, 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 well-known American online recruitment company that provides services for both individuals and commercial entities. The Complainant attracts more than 157 million global job seekers, 4.3 million employers and has over 40 million job alert email subscribers. Since its inception in 2010, the Complainant has served more than one million employers and 120 million job seekers.

The Complainant has been recognized as one of the fastest-growing technology companies in North America and was ranked 350 in Deloitte's 2019 Technology Fast 500. It was also named on Fast Company's 2019 list of 'The World's Most Innovative Companies' within the 'Enterprise' sector. The Complainant has further been the recipient of a number of G2 Awards. The Complainant is frequently featured in lists collating the best online job recruitment services.

The Complainant is headquartered in the United States, but has expanded its reach globally, offering recruitment services to businesses and job seekers in multiple countries.

The Complainant relies on its substantive rights and interests in the ZIPRECRUITER term and avers that such rights and interests arise from its exclusive, extensive and consistent use of this mark within the global marketplace. The Complainant's trademark portfolio covers numerous jurisdictions and, by way of example, includes the following registrations in the United States, European Union, United Kingdom, and Canada;

Trademark, Country, Registration Number, Registration Date, Classes Covered:

- ZIPRECRUITER, United States, 3934310, March 22, 2011, 42;
- ZIPRECRUITER, European Union, 015070873, June 13, 2016, 41 and 42;
- ZIPRECRUITER, United Kingdom, UK00915070873, June 13, 2016-, 9,36,41 and 42;
- ZIPRECRUITER.COM, United Kingdom, UK00915070881, June 13,2016, 9,36,41 and 42
- ZIPRECRUITER.CO.UK, United Kingdom, UK00915644041, November 4,2016, 9, 36, 41, and 42;
- ZIPRECRUITER, Canada, TMA979480, August 28,2017, 9,41 and 42

The Complainant's online platform is the foundation of its business, which it operates primarily from "www.ziprecruiter.com". It allows employers to post jobs and manage applications and enables job seekers to search for and receive alerts regarding the latest job posts. Through the Complainant's website, job seekers can create a candidate profile to access job opportunities. Employers can use the Complainant's candidate dashboard to streamline candidate review, manage and find qualified candidates. The Complainant's website has received an average of more than 30 million visits per month between January and March 2026.

The Complainant also uses its mark in connection with many country code Top Level Domains "ccTLDs". A sample list of these registrations is presented below. They allow the Complainant to tailor its offerings to users across a number of countries.

Domain Name, Registration Date;

<ziprecruiter.com>, February 23, 2010;

<ziprecruiter.co.uk>, September 9, 2010;

<ziprecruiter.co>, May 11, 2013;

<ziprecruiter.co.nz>, May 12, 2015;

<ziprecruiter.fr>, January 14, 2016;

<ziprecruiter.us>, August 24; 2018.

The Complainant offers a popular mobile application, available on both Google Play and the Apple Store. The Complainant's application has been downloaded more than 10 million times on Google Play.

The Complainant uses the ticker symbol `ZIP' for the stock exchange market.

The Complainant is active on social media, promoting its products and service online under the ZIPRECRUITER name, particularly on Facebook, X, Instagram, YouTube and LinkedIn.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on March 24, 2026 long after the Complainant registered its mark.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent does not have any trademark rights to the term ZIPRECRUITER or any other term used in the Disputed Domain Name. There is also no evidence that the Respondent retains unregistered trademark rights to the term ZIPRECRUITER. The Respondent has not received any license from the Complainant to use domain names featuring the ZIPRECRUITER trademark.

The Disputed Domain Name currently does not resolve to any active content and displays a "403 error" webpage. It previously resolved to a website using the ZIPRECRUITER trademark and purporting to offer job opportunities and recruitment services.

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.

The Complainant states that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its mark and incorporates the mark. The addition of the word "news" does not dispel a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name. It is not authorized to use the Complainant's mark. Its only use of the Disputed Domain Name has been to mislead Internet users by seeking them to use it for recruitment purposes.

The Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark is well known. The Disputed Domain Name was registered years after the registration of the Complainant's trademark. It has been used to disrupt the Complainant's business.

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 a 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 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 term, here "news", 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 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 Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In particular, the Respondent initially used the Disputed Domain Name to disrupt the Complainant's business by attempting to attract potential customers of the Complaint using a confusingly similar 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 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.

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

The Complainant's mark was well known and was registered long before the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that the Respondent initially used the Disputed Domain Name to attract the Complainant's potential customers is evidence that the Respondent was well aware of the Complaint and its business. The Respondent then held the Disputed Domain Name passively.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <ziprecruiter-news.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edward C. Chiasson K.C./

Edward C. Chiasson K.C.

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2026