

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ServiceTitan, Inc. v. Noah Clarke

Case No. D2026-2243

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ServiceTitan, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Noah Clarke, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <www-servicetitan.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 25, 2026. On May 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 27, 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 / Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same date, 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 28, 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 June 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on June 26, 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that the Complainant is a leading provider of cloud-based software for the home and commercial services industry, describing itself as the number one software platform for commercial and residential trades. Founded in 2011, the Complainant serves contractors and field service businesses operating across a wide range of trades, including plumbing, HVAC, electrical, roofing, garage door, and related sectors. The SERVICETITAN platform enables those businesses to manage scheduling, dispatching, invoicing, customer communications, and business analytics from a single integrated system.

The Complainant is the registered owner of United States registered trademark no. 4648578 SERVICETITAN, registered on December 2, 2014 for services in class 42; United States registered trademark no. 5451884 SERVICETITAN, registered on April 24, 2018, for goods and services in classes 9 and 42.

The Complainant operates its principal website at "www.servicetitan.com", through which the SERVICETITAN platform is promoted and made available to customers.

The disputed domain name <www-servicetitan.com> was registered on July 23, 2025. The undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant's trademark and logo and screenshots taken from the Complainant's official website and login portal; in addition the Complainant provided evidence that the HTML source code of the website associated with the disputed domain name reveals the presence of a Google AdSense advertising unit. On March 1, 2026, the Complainant's agent wrote to the Respondent via the Registrar's Domain Holder Contact Request Form. No response has been received from the Respondent.

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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's SERVICETITAN trademark, because it incorporates the Complainant's SERVICETITAN mark in its entirety. The only modification is the prefixing of the mark with the string "www-", which is recognised as a common reference to the World Wide Web and is routinely used as a subdomain prefix for websites. Its use as a prefix within a domain name, separated from the mark by a hyphen rather than a dot, is a well-recognised typosquatting device designed to intercept Internet users who mistype the correct URL of a website.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the name SERVICETITAN or WWW-SERVICETITAN. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any permission, consent, or authorisation from the Complainant to use the SERVICETITAN name or mark in connection with the registration of the disputed domain name, or otherwise. Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name carries a clear risk of implied affiliation and therefore cannot constitute fair use. The Complainant avers that the incorporation of its highly distinctive SERVICETITAN name and mark falsely suggests affiliation between the Respondent and the

Complainant. The addition of the prefix “www-“ reinforces rather than dispels that suggestion, as it mimics the form of the Complainant's official web address and the Complainant contends it is calculated to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is the Complainant's official website.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a website consisting of artificial intelligence (“AI”) generated text about the Complainant's SERVICETITAN platform and software products, interspersed with pay-per-click advertisements served via Google AdSense. Such a website, sometimes referred to as a “splog” or spam blog, exists not to provide genuine information or services to Internet users, but rather to exploit the attractive force of a well-known trademark in order to generate pay-per-click advertising revenue. The Complainant suggests such “splogs” are analogous to pay per click advertising. The Complainant avers that the pay-per-click advertising on the website associated with the disputed domain name exploits the value of the Complainant's name and mark. This is evidenced by the Google AdSense code identified in the HTML source of the website, which confirms that the website is actively monetized through a live AdSense publisher account.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's SERVICETITAN mark in its entirety. The prefix “www-“ is a well-recognized typosquatting device that mimics the form of the Complainant's official web address and is calculated to intercept Internet users who mistype the correct URL “www.servicetitan.com”. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The disputed domain name resolves to a website consisting of AI-generated content about the Complainant's SERVICETITAN platform, which the Complainant characterizes as a “splog” or spam blog. The site uses AI-generated content about the Complainant's products as a vehicle for displaying pay-per-click advertisements served via Google AdSense. The website associated with the disputed domain name exists not to provide genuine information to Internet users, but to exploit the attractive force of the Complainant's SERVICETITAN mark. The presence of a live Google AdSense publisher account confirms that the website is actively monetized through pay-per-click advertising revenue generated by traffic drawn to the disputed domain name by reason of its confusing similarity to the Complainant's mark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “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”. Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

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

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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, "www" and a hyphen, 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 demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name contains the Complainant's registered trademark entirely, plus the prefix "www" - being a common reference to the World Wide Web - and a hyphen. The nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation: In fact, terms with an "inherent Internet connotation", such as "www", are seen as tending to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 2.5.1.

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.

By the time the disputed domain name was registered, the Panel considers it to be unlikely that the Respondent did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its mark. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and deliberately targeted it when it registered the disputed domain name.

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.

In this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the Panel's finding that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- (i) the nature of the disputed domain name (incorporating the Complainant's mark entirely plus the prefix "www" being a common reference to the World Wide Web, and a hyphen. In addition, the disputed domain name is identical (apart from the prefix "www" which is clearly intended to emulate the prefix "www." of an authentic Internet address) to the domain name used for the Complainant's official website "www.servicetitan.com";
- (ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves (i.e. reproducing the Complainant's trademark and logo and screenshots taken from the Complainant's official website and login portal);
- (iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name;
- (iv) the Complainant's provided evidence that the HTML source code of the website associated with the disputed domain name reveals the presence of a Google AdSense advertising unit, confirming that the website is actively monetized through pay-per-click advertising;
- (v) the Respondent's concealing its identity with the use of a privacy service; and
- (vi) the Respondent's failure to reply to the cease-and-desist letter and to submit a Response.

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 <www-servicetitan.com> be transferred to the Complainant

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: July 10, 2026