

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

OPENLANE, Inc. v. Name Redacted

Case No. D2026-2396

1. The Parties

The Complainant is OPENLANE, Inc., United States of America ("US"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <openlanecareers.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 3, 2026. On June 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 June 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 1, 2026.

¹The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

The Center appointed Dennis A. Foster as the sole panelist in this matter on July 3, 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, OPENLANE, headquartered in Carmel, Indiana, US, is a provider of digital automotive marketplaces for dealers, fleet operators, rental companies and financial institutions to match automobile buyers with cars.

The Complainant has some 4,500 employees and operating locations across North America, Europe, the Philippines, and Uruguay. Its automotive marketplaces and other services support customers in over 40 countries. The Complainant's digital marketplace sales are initiated online and include OPENLANE US, OPENLANE Canada and OPENLANE Europe sales. In 2024, the Complainant sold over 1.4 million vehicles with USD 1.8 billion in revenue.

The Complainant maintains a strong Internet presence. According to SimilarWeb, the Complainant's primary website <openlane.com>, which the Complainant has owned since 2008, received, e.g., a total of more than 482,000 individual visits in March 2026.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations in various jurisdictions including the US Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"), Canadian Intellectual Property Office ("CIPO"), United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office ("UKIPO") and European Union Intellectual Property Office ("EUIPO"). For example:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION/ TM OFFICE	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	INTERNATIONAL CLASS
OPENLANE	US / USPTO	4268846	January 1, 2013	35, vehicle supply management etc.
OPENLANE	Canada / CIPO	TMA757102	January 15, 2010	35, 36, 37, 39, 42, per above
OPENLANE	United Kingdom / UKIPO	UK00003906284	July 21, 2023	35, 39, per above
OPENLANE	European Union / EUIPO	018868545	September 12, 2023	35, 39, per above

The disputed domain name was registered on April 9, 2026. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to impersonate employees of the Complainant by sending emails using the email address at the disputed domain name. The Respondent also uses the disputed domain name for a landing page to redirect Internet visitors to third party Internet addresses and websites.

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 per the below.

The Complainant's OPENLANE registered trademarks give it standing to bring these UDRP proceedings to recover the disputed domain name.

The addition of a generic word to the Complainant's trademark does not negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant has not given the Respondent a license or authorization to use its trademark in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way.

The Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to pass himself off as the Complainant and to phish for personal information. Such fraudulent use can never confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent also uses the disputed domain name website to re-direct Internet visitors to third party websites in a Pay-Per-Click ("PPC") scheme that presumably is for financial gain.

The Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent showed prior surveillance and knowledge of the Complainant when, right after registering the disputed domain name, he used it to impersonate the Complainant in a phishing and passing-off scheme.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to Policy paragraphs 4(a)(i), (ii), and (iii), the Panel may render a decision for the Complainant and grant a transfer of the disputed domain name, if the Complainant shows that:

The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Per its annexed trademark registration copies detailed in the Factual Background section above, the Complainant is the owner of OPENLANE trademark rights. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.2.1 ("Where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case.").

The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's OPENLANE trademark which is readily recognizable in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has added the term "careers" to the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name. It is well established under the Policy that the addition of other terms to a trademark does not prevent a finding of identity or confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8 ("Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.").

Per the long-standing consensus in Policy decisions, the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), “.com”, is not taken into consideration in this identity or confusing similarity analysis because it is viewed as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel thus finds that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(i) to show that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Owing to the difficulty of proving a negative, the Policy consensus is that initially it is sufficient for the Complainant to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Then the burden of evidence production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with credible evidence to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant’s prima facie case prevails. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. Furthermore, the Complainant contends that it has not given the Respondent any license or authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark in any manner, including in domain names.

The Complainant also has produced copies of emails showing the Respondent, impersonating the Complainant, has sent phishing emails from the disputed domain name targeting prospective employees of the Complainant. This type of malfeasance can never be a basis for rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the Complainant has made out at least a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent, being in default in these proceedings, has not come forward to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case. The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant’s prima facie case prevails. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Hence, the Panel finds that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii) to show that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy at paragraph 4(b) sets out four non-exclusive grounds on which a Panel can base a finding of registration and use of a disputed domain name in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv), in particular, informs us that bad faith can be established by demonstrating that the Respondent has “intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [Respondent’s] website [...] by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the web site or location of a product or service on [Respondent’s] website or location.” See *KT Intellectual Property Holding Company, LLC v. Henry Findstein et. al.*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-2047](#) (“[...] the disputed domain name appears to have been registered in bad faith, in the full knowledge of the Complainant’s plans and with the intent to benefit in some way from the ownership of a domain name that was likely to confuse Internet users into thinking it was that of, or in some way related to or authorized by, the Complainant.”)

The Complainant and its OPENLANE trademark are known internationally. Also, the Complainant has marketed and sold its goods and services using this trademark since 2008, which is well before Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent must have been familiar with the Complainant’s brand and business when he registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant as part of a phishing scam designed to obtain personal information is further evidence of the Respondent’s familiarity with the Complainant and of the Respondent’s bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Finally, the Respondent also used the landing page at the disputed domain name to re-direct Internet visitors to third party websites in a PPC scheme likely for monetary benefit, and used a false name and address to register the disputed domain, all of which are evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds, then, that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii) to show that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed 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 disputed domain name <openlanecareers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dennis A. Foster/

Dennis A. Foster

Sole Panelist

Date: July 17, 2026