

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MasTec North America, Inc. v. Will Jennings
Case No. D2026-2364

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MasTec North America, Inc.,¹ United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Will Jennings, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rnastecpurnell.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 1, 2026. On June 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On June 2, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name that differed from the named Respondent (Not Provided) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to amend the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 3, 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”).

¹ The amended Complaint identified MasTec North America, Inc., as the Complainant in the caption and in paragraph 2 in section II(A), “[t]he Complainant”. The Complaint also inconsistently refers to MasTec, Inc., the parent of MasTec North America, Inc. (“Parent Company”), as the Complainant throughout the body of the Complaint.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint and the amended Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for a response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 1, 2026.

The Center appointed A. Justin Ourso III as the sole panelist in this matter on July 6, 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's Parent Company is a publicly traded corporation with headquarters in Coral Gables, Florida, United States, is an infrastructure construction company operating primarily throughout North America, including the building, installation, maintenance, and improvement of a broad range of energy, communications, and utility infrastructure. The Complainant's group of companies has operated under its MASTEC mark for over 80 years. A subsidiary of the Parent Company, MasTec Purnell Canada, Inc. ("MasTec Purnell"), is a Canadian infrastructure construction company engaging in similar activities.

The Complainant owns United States registration No. 2,130,081, for its MASTEC trademark, issued on January 20, 1998, for various industrial, infrastructure, and commercial construction and maintenance services in Class 37, and for engineering design and technical consulting for utility industries and traffic safety systems in Class 42, and United States registration No. 2,544,425, for its MASTEC figurative trademark, issued on March 5, 2002, for various infrastructure construction, installation, and maintenance services in Class 37, and for engineering design and technical consulting in the telecommunications and sewer industries and for traffic safety systems in Class 42.²

The Parent Company owns Canada registration No. TMA628530, for its MASTEC figurative trademark, issued on December 16, 2004, for various infrastructure construction, installation, and maintenance services in Class 37, and for engineering design and technical consulting in the telecommunications and utility industries and for traffic safety systems in Class 42.

The Parent Company owns the domain name <mastec.com>, registered in 1996, and operates a corporate public-facing web site "www.mastec.com," through which it advertises its services. Its MasTec Purnell subsidiary owns the domain name <mastecpurnell.com>, registered on March 26, 2025, and operated a web site at "www.mastecpurnell.com" since December 2025. The subsidiary uses its domain name for its email, as in "[...].@mastecpurnell.com."

The Respondent registered the Domain Name on January 15, 2026, without any authorization from the Complainant and, within days, used the Domain Name to send an email impersonating an employee of MasTec Purnell and targeting a vendor with a phishing scheme regarding an electronic funds transfer. When registering the Domain Name, the Respondent used the Registrar's privacy service and provided false contact details. Prior to and since the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name has not resolved to a web page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy to transfer the Domain Name, which it requested.

² The Complainant offered another United States registration in support of its trademark rights, but this registration, for goods in Class 7, is owned by a Chinese entity that is not a subsidiary of the Complainant and appears to have no connection with this proceeding.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent acquired the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant by sending email messages to the Complainant's vendors to engage in fraudulent financial transactions; the Respondent sent to a vendor an email, fraudulently impersonating an employee of MasTec Purnell, in which the Respondent requested electronic funds transfer details; and the Respondent provided false contact details to the Registrar.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a response.

6. Discussion and Findings

A complainant must prove three elements to obtain relief: (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights; (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and (iii) the respondent registered and is using the domain name in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

On the first element, a complainant must prove that (1) it has rights in a trademark and (2) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to this trademark. Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

The Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark registrations establish the Complainant's trademark rights. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1,"](#)) section 1.2.1.

The Domain Name replaces the "m" in the mark MASTEC with the letters "r" and "n," which, in lower case (the customary case for domain names in computer systems) as in "rn," is almost indistinguishable from a lower case "m." Notwithstanding this character difference, because the visual appearance is virtually identical, the Panel finds that the trademark is recognizable within the Domain Name, notwithstanding the addition of the element "purnell" after the trademark. The Panel finds that the addition of the term "purnell" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. So, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.9.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the first element: the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent impersonated an accounts receivable administrator of MasTec Purnell using the email address "[...]@rnastecpurnell.com" to induce a third-party vendor into communications regarding an electronic funds transfer. In this Panel's view, the deliberate, deceptive use of an email address configured with a domain name that is confusingly similar to a trademark belies any claim of legitimate interests in a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

Also, the Respondent used a privacy service and provided the Registrar with false contact details, which betrays an illegitimate interest. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3. Additionally, the Respondent failed to provide any evidence of an actual or a planned bona fide commercial use, a noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Name, or even to respond to the Complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3. On the contrary, the evidence shows impersonation and an intended deceptive use for commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the second element: the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant has submitted a two-page document in support of its claim that the Respondent acquired the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant by sending phishing email messages to the

Complainant's vendors to engage in fraudulent financial transactions and its claim that the Respondent sent to a Complainant vendor an email, fraudulently impersonating an employee of the MasTec Purnell. The two pages reflect the same two emails in an email exchange. Only one email is dated – the one from an impersonated employee accounts receivable administrator of the Complainant. The date has been redacted (without showing a redaction) from the email sent by the Complainant's vendor, without explanation. Both emails, contain "RE:" at the beginning of the "Subject" field, evidencing that it is a reply – not the original email in the exchange. This evidence demonstrates that the Complainant has not offered as evidence the entire email exchange.

Additionally, the content of the emails is innocuous: "Thank you for you [sic] message. We are awaiting your feedback accordingly" from the impersonator and "Can you please complete the attached form and return" from the vendor. Nothing in the contents of either email hints of a fraudulent financial transaction. The better practice would have been to include the entire email exchange, so that a panelist could confidently conclude that phishing or a fraudulent financial transaction at stake.

One small data point – the subject heading "RE EFT Update" – which presumably references an electronic funds transfer – that enables the Panel, when combined with the representations of the Complainant in its amended Complaint, to find that the Respondent attempted to induce a third-party vendor into communications regarding an electronic funds transfer.

The Panel finds that the use of a Domain Name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; the use in the signature block in the impersonating email of the name of an accounts receivable administrator of MasTec Purnell, the administrator's actual email address, and MasTec Purnell's actual domain name; and the sending of an impersonating email to the Complainant's vendor regarding an electronic funds transfer, within days after registering the Domain Name, are, collectively, conclusive evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark before the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Panel finds that the Respondent deliberately chose the Domain Name for deceptive emails targeting the Complainant's business for commercial gain.

Promptly after registering the Domain Name, the Respondent impersonated an employee of MasTec Purnell in communications regarding an electronic funds transfer, which is a deceptive and illegitimate activity and a bad faith use of the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4, 3.2.1, and 3.4. Additionally, the Respondent used a privacy service, provided the Registrar with false registration data, and failed to submit a response to the Complaint, all of which support a conclusion of bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1, 3.6, and 4.3. These findings compel the Panel's conclusion that the Respondent (1) intentionally registered the Domain Name in bad faith to impersonate an employee for an illegitimate purpose targeting the Complainant's business and (2) used it in bad faith to impersonate an employee for an illegitimate purpose targeting the Complainant for its own illegitimate commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1, 3.1.4, 3.2.1, and 3.4. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the third element: the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

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 Name <rnastecpurnell.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/A. Justin Ourso III/

A. Justin Ourso III

Sole Panelist

Date: July 20, 2026