

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pye-Barker Fire & Safety, LLC v. Adrian Tregent and Diane Moore Case No. D2026-2082

1. The Parties

Complainant is Pye-Barker Fire & Safety, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP, United States.

Respondents are Adrian Tregent, United States, and Diane Moore, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <pyebarkers.com> (“Domain Name 1”) and <pyebarker.services> (Domain Name 2”) (collectively, referred to as the “Domain Names”) are respectively registered with NameSilo, LLC and GoDaddy.com, LLC (together the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 14, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On May 15, and May 18, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC / Privacy User #ed2fe76f, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 19, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting Complainant to either file a separate complaint for the Domain Name associated with a different underlying registrant or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 20, 2026, and an amendment to the Complaint on May 28, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and 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 Respondents 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. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on June 22, 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 fully integrated and full-service fire protection, life safety, and security services provider in the United States, with hundreds of locations and 9,000 team members across 47 States. It offers a wide range of services, including installation and servicing of portable extinguishers, restaurant fire suppression systems, special hazard systems, fire sprinklers, fire alarms, physical security, access control, CCTV, and intrusion detection.

Complainant owns several registered trademarks with the PYE-BARKER mark or PYE BARKER in combination with other terms, including:

- United States registered trademark number 7436794, for the PYE-BARKER word mark, registered on July 9, 2024;
- United States registered trademark number 7396241, for the PYE BARKER FIRE & SAFETY SINCE 1946 figurative mark, registered on May 28, 2024; and
- United States registered trademark number 7634964, for the PB PYE-BARKER FIRE & SAFETY EST. 1946 figurative mark, registered on December 31, 2024.

Complainant's trademarks will hereafter be referred to as the "PYE-BARKER Trademarks".

Domain Name 1, registered on May 4, 2026, resolved to an inactive site. However, Domain Name 1 was configured with email capabilities and used to send at least one fraudulent email requesting payment from Complainant's customer.

Domain Name 2, registered on April 27, 2026, redirected to a website labelled ".Attorney" with a banner at the top stating "Marketing Campaigns for Attorney Services" and which feature various Pay-Per-Click ("PPC") links to third party websites such as "Law Firm Website Marketing" and "Digital Marketing for Law Firms".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark; (ii) Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names; and (iii) Respondents registered and are using the Domain Names in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for PYE-BARKER and that Respondents registered and are using the Domain Names, with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for Complainant's bona fide and well-known services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondents, nor authorized Respondents to register or use a domain name which includes Complainant's trademark, and that Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Names. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondents have acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Names, when Respondents clearly knew of Complainant's rights. Specifically, Complainant argues that Respondents used Domain Name 1 to impersonate or pose as Complainant, in furtherance of an illegal scheme to impersonate employees of Complainant so as to induce Complainant's client to direct future payments to a billing account under Respondent's control. Complainant also argues that Respondents used Domain Name 2 to trade off the goodwill and reputation of Complainant's PYE-BARKER marks or otherwise create a false association with Complainant.

B. Respondents

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Respondents

Complainant requests consolidation of the nominally different domain name registrants for the Domain Names into a single proceeding because they are under common ownership and/or control for the following reasons: the Domain Names were registered within a week of each other, following registration dates of similar other domain names which are involved in an ongoing UDRP matter; the nonpublic registration data from this other UDRP matter and the proceeding at hand, when released, follows the same pattern of presenting as random individuals from around the country that have no apparent connection to Complainant, indicating that Respondents are engaged in a pattern of registering domains involving the PYE-BARKER Trademarks in order to trade off of Complainant's goodwill and obfuscate their own identity.

Complainant further contends that the combination of the above factors justifies the filing of a single Complaint for the two Domain Names, and that it would be fair and equitable to all parties to do so.

Respondents did not comment on Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the Domain Names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin Panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control

the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s).

As regards the common control, the Panel notes the highly similar composition of the Domain Names and the close registration dates.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different domain name registrants (referred to hereinafter as the "Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names; and
- (iii) the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) states that failure to respond to complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the PYE-BARKER Trademarks, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the PYE-BARKER Trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the PYE-BARKER Trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Names, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain in which they were registered (in this case, ".com" and ".services"), are identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, Domain Name 1 is confusingly similar to Complainant's PYE-BARKER trademark. The PYE-BARKER trademark is recognizable in the Domain Name. The absence of a hyphen between "pye" and "barker", and the addition of the letter "s" after Complainant's trademark in Domain Name 1 does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between Domain Name 1 and the PYE-BARKER trademark. See section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

With regards to Domain Name 2, the absence of a hyphen between "pye" and "barker" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between Domain Name 2 and the PYE-BARKER trademark. Domain Names 1 and 2 are, for all practical purposes, confusingly similar to Complainant's mark.

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on complainant. If a respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its PYE-BARKER Trademarks and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the PYE-BARKER Trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating this trademark. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the PYE-BARKER Trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Names.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that Domain Name 1 was configured to set up email communications capability, with email addresses such as “[...]@pyebarkers.com”, that closely resemble Complainant’s legitimate email addresses, and was further used to send at least one fraudulent email to Complainant’s customers, purporting to provide the client with a “10% discount” and new banking account information to which future payments may be directed, in an attempt to divert payments to an account under Respondent’s control. In particular, Respondent posed as an “Accounts Receivable Administrator” employed with Complainant to lend credibility to the fraudulent communication. Complainant confirmed that this email was not sent or authorized by Complainant and submitted it was sent to impersonate Complainant to fraudulently obtain payment.

UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for illegal activity – such as phishing – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Also in addition, with regards to Domain Name 2, Respondent has not used Domain Name 2 in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that Domain Name 2 resolved to a website which featured various PPC links to third party websites for marketing attorney services, which are unrelated to Complainant’s business. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and cannot under the circumstances confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in Domain Name 2.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent’s actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location."

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the PYE-BARKER trademark predate the registration of the Domain Names. Complainant is also well established and known; indeed, the record shows that Complainant's PYE-BARKER Trademarks and related products and services are known and recognized for purposes of the Policy. Therefore, and also noting the use analysis below, Respondent was clearly aware of the PYE-BARKER Trademarks when it registered the Domain Names.

Moreover, the Domain Names' inclusion of Complainant's trademark PYE-BARKER entirely, further reflects the awareness that Respondent had of Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration. Complainant also owns and operates its website at the domain name <pyebarkerfs.com>. Such adoption of Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the Domain Names – noting also the use of Domain Name 1 in furtherance of a fraudulent email scheme impersonating Complainant – illustrates Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Names and Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites at the Domain Names.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Also noted above, Respondent most likely registered and is using the Domain Names to trade off the reputation of Complainant's PYE-BARKER Trademarks.

In particular, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the record shows that the Domain Name 1 was configured to set up email communications capability, and further used to send at least one fraudulent email to Complainant's client, purporting to provide the client with new banking account information to which future payments may be directed, in an attempt to divert funds legitimately due to Complainant, to an account under Respondent's control.

Complainant confirmed that this email was not sent or authorized by Complainant and submits it was sent to impersonate Complainant to fraudulently obtain payment, or obtain confidential financial information or trade secrets. Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent.

UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent's use of a domain name to send deceptive emails, as here, constitutes bad faith. Moreover, such use of the Domain Name 1 may potentially result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

With regards to Domain Name 2, Respondent was using Domain Name 2 to host a PPC or monetizing page that included links for various services unrelated to Complainant's business services. The webpage featured banners such as "Law Firm Website Marketing", "Digital Marketing for Law Firms". Respondent more likely than not registered and is using Domain Name 2 to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion with

the well-known PYE-BARKER products and services of Complainant. The use of Domain Name 2 to divert users to the webpage with PPC links to third party websites, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark is in bad faith.

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a response. In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the PYE-BARKER trademark, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Names <pyebarkers.com> and <pyebarker.services> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: June 29, 2026