

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MasTec North America, Inc. v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. D2026-2117

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MasTec North America, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mastecinternal.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 15, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 19, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 20, 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 21, 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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on June 15, 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 an infrastructure construction company operating mainly throughout the United States. The Complainant owns a United States trademark registration number 2130081 for MASTEC registered on January 20, 1998. The Complainant markets its services through the domain name <mastec.com>, registered on April 25, 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 15, 2026. It does not currently resolve to an active website. The Complainant asserts that in the past it resolved to a website that impersonated the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MASTEC mark in full, changing the mark only by adding the term "internal" at the end and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com".

The mere additions of a gTLD and generic terms to a complainant's mark fails to produce a domain name distinct from the complainant's mark, especially when the generic terms added describe or are associated with the complainant's business as is the case here.

The addition of the term "internal" to the Complainant's MASTEC mark actually increases the likelihood of confusion based on the direct association of those words with the Complainant's internal support ticket system.

Without the Complainant's authorization or consent, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which misappropriates and is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MASTEC mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to register and/or use the disputed domain name.

Use of a domain name to impersonate a complainant in furtherance of fraud establishes that a respondent has no legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's rights in its MASTEC mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent's pattern of prior bad faith registration of domain names utilizing well-known trademarks in which the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests provides further evidence of the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

- (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 disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's trademark, the word "internal", and the gTLD ".com".

The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)).

The insertion of the word "internal" does not prevent the confusing similarity between the dispute domain name and the Complainant's trademark. See Section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent is not called "mastec" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks or that the Respondent has made a bona fide offering or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The uncontroverted evidence of a past website to which the disputed domain name resolved until recently suggests that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant. The website to which the disputed domain name resolved presented itself as being the Complainant, using the Complainant's trademark and logo. On registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its business and wished to divert Internet users seeking the Complainant's website to its own in order to possibly obtain personal data.

All this is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. There is no need to deal with the Complainant's other allegations.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element.

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 <mastecinternal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Samuel/

Adam Samuel

Sole Panelist

Date: June 22, 2026