

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Trusted Tech Team, LLC v. sadaf zubair, pcc
Case No. D2026-2627

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Trusted Tech Team, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP, United States.

The Respondent is sadaf zubair, pcc, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <trustedtechteam.digital> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 16, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On June 18, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 19, 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 June 23, 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Weston as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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

The Complainant is a technology solutions provider founded in 2017 that operates a global Microsoft Cloud Solutions Provider (CSP) business specializing in Microsoft licensing, cloud services, and enterprise IT support with more than 7,500 cloud subscribers and over 40,000 licensing customers worldwide. The Complainant holds registrations for the trademark TRUSTED TECH TEAM, and variations of it, in numerous jurisdictions including United States Registration No. 5,629,265 for the mark TRUSTED TECH TEAM registered on December 11, 2018 in International Class 35; United States Registration No. 7,710,523 for the mark TRUSTED TECH TEAM registered on March 4, 2025 in International Classes 42 and 45

The Complainant owns numerous domains that incorporate its trademarks including the domain name <trustedtechteam.com>, which has resolved to its main website since 2017.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 1, 2025 and resolves to a webpage that apes the Complainant's main website, displaying identical words that also appear on the Complainant's webpage including the words "Microsoft Solutions Partner", "Trusted Tech" and "We Make It Easy", and a stylized "T" logo, and uses the same background color.

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 cites its registrations for the trademarks TRUSTED TECH TEAM, as prima facie evidence of ownership.

The Complainant submits that the mark TRUSTED TECH TEAM is "famous" and that its rights in that mark predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name. It submits that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark, because the Disputed Domain Name is comprised of the TRUSTED TECH TEAM trademark and that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".digital" is not sufficient to prevent the finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because the Respondent "is not authorized by the Complainant to use the Domain Name in dispute; [t]he Complainant's trade and service marks are known; [t]here is no indication that the Respondent is known under the [D]isputed Domain Name; [t]he [Disputed] Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark and serves as 'bait' to attract customers to Respondent's site; [t]he [D]isputed Domain Name is primarily descriptive of Complainant's services as it incorporates Complainant's trade and service mark", and that none of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy apply. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent's website features a modified version of the Complainant's logo "prominently at the top of the website's homepage without any disclosure of the lack of relationship with the Complainant" which is not a legitimate or fair use under the Policy.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name was, and currently is, in bad faith, contrary to the Policy and the Rules having regard to evidence that points to awareness of the Complainant and its trademark. On the issue of registration in bad faith the Complainant submits that the "Respondent plainly knew or had reason to know of Complainant's long and continuous use

of its TRUSTED TECH TEAM® Marks at the time of registration”. On the issue of bad faith use, the Complainant submits that the “[D]isputed [D]omain [N]ame has been used to host an almost exact replica Complainant’s website”, and contends that such use is indicative of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

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

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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. The requirements of the first element for purposes of the Policy may be satisfied by a trademark registered in any country. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Complainant has produced sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has registered trademark rights in the mark TRUSTED TECH TEAM.

Turning to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the TRUSTED TECH TEAM trademark, the Panel observes that the Disputed Domain Name is comprised of: (a) an exact reproduction of the Complainant’s trademark TRUSTED TECH TEAM; (b) followed by the gTLD “.digital”.

It is well established that the gTLD used as part of a domain name is generally disregarded under the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11. The relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name, specifically: “trustedtechteam”.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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 Disputed 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.

The Panel notes that the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its trademark and that there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, let alone any accurate or prominent disclosure of that relationship, or absence of such, on its website. The use of the Complainant's trademark in the Disputed Domain Name and the substantial similarity of the Parties' respective websites suggests that the Respondent has deliberately targeted the Complainant. The Panel finds that the Respondent's activities do not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, given the substantial reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's mark or capacity to otherwise mislead Internet users.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent (this analysis remains applicable here, even though the terms "tech team" are disclaimed in the relevant mark). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

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 the present case, the Panel finds that the evidence in the case shows the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

On the issue of registration, taking into account the composition of the Disputed Domain Name incorporating the Complainant's trademark, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant's trademark TRUSTED TECH TEAM when it registered the Disputed Domain Name.

Further, a gap of several years between registration of a complainant's trademark and respondent's registration of a disputed domain name (containing the trademark) may indicate bad faith registration. In this case, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name 7 years after the Complainant established registered trademark rights in the TRUSTED TECH TEAM mark and apparently targeted it, as evidenced by the use to which the Disputed Domain Name has been put. The Respondent has not come forward to rebut the Complainant's allegations or to offer an alternative explanation.

On the issue of use, the Complainant's evidence is that the Disputed Domain Name was used to host a website that aped the Complainant's to the extent they were nearly identical . The Respondent subsequently changed its website layout and adopted a different colour scheme after the Complainant had filed a complaint with the hosting provider, but kept a stylized "T" logo and references to "USTRusted Tech".

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, alleged passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The Complainant supplied evidence of the misleading website as it then was before any modifications adopted by the Respondent, and the Panel finds it was strikingly similar to the Complainant's in many respects. The Panel accepts that the display by the Respondent on its website of the term "USTRustedTech", would be likely to compound the confusion including in the period following the adoption of changes by the Respondent. In the circumstances, having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <trustedtechteam.digital> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Weston/

Nicholas Weston

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2026