

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Insurify, Inc. v. zaid dweiri, Whispers International
Case No. D2026-2028

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Insurify, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Law Office of C. Allen Bargfrede, United States.

The Respondent is zaid dweiri, Whispers International, Jordan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <insuriifi.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 11, 2026. On May 12, 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 (Uknown / Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 15, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 21, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Christos A. Theodoulou as the sole panelist in this matter on June 24, 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, Insurify, Inc. was founded in 2013 and is the top insurance comparison engine online. Over the years, the Complainant has invested heavily in protecting the value and distinctiveness of Insurify IP, expending significant sums of efforts advertising and promoting its name, according to the uncontested allegations of the Complainant. As a result of more than ten years dedication, Complainant has cultivated substantial goodwill with the public regarding the Insurify IP.

The Complainant is the owner of federal trademark registrations in its products and services, including United States Registration No. 5894009 INSURIFY, registered on October 29, 2019.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <insurify.com> since January 26, 2006.

The disputed domain name <insuriifi.com> was created on April 18, 2026, and resolved at some point in time to a copycat website. The disputed domain name currently resolves to a parking page.

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 disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its trademark INSURIFY in which the Complainant has rights, that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant registered its trademark and domain name and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Moreover, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, that the Respondent has no relation to the Complainant in any way. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent was neither licensed nor authorized to make any use of the Complainant's INSURIFY trademark.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark was registered and used by the Complainant long before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

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 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 INSURIFY trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's INSURIFY trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's trademark only by the omission of the letter "y" and the addition of an extra letter before the final "f". Such minor alterations do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's INSURIFY trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8. The entirety of the INSURIFY mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, except for the addition of "l" instead of "y". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. and 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.

In particular and based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services; that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and that the Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, it is to be noted that the Respondent did not present evidence of any license or permission by the Complainant, with whom there seems to exist no relationship whatsoever.

In addition, the Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's distinctive trademark in its entirety with the substitution of the letter "i" carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

As a conclusion on this point, 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's disputed domain name was created on April 18, 2026, whereas the Complainant's trademark had already been registered. From the evidence at hand, the Panel finds that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, must have been aware of the Complainant's trademarks. Therefore, the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith (See, *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#), and *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#)).

The disputed domain name used to host a website impersonating the Complainant's website. By operating a copycat website, the Respondent appears to be attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by exploiting the Complainant's mark. The imitation of the Complainant's website, together with the incorporation of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name, supports that the Respondent registered the domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's rights and with the intention of misleading Internet users.

As a consequence of the above, 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 <insuriifi.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christos A. Theodoulou/

Christos A. Theodoulou

Sole Panelist

Date: June 29, 2026