

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Allegis Group v. Weendzor Louime
Case No. D2026-2688

1. The Parties

Complainant is Allegis Group, United States of America (“United States”), represented by ZeroFox, United States.

Respondent is Weendzor Louime, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <global-teksystems.cloud> is registered with IONOS SE (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 19, 2026. On June 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 24, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 24, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 25, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2026. Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 25, 2026, with the subject line including “Response”. Respondent also filed a Response with the Center on July 20, 2026, consisting of the Center’s Model Response. The Center sent an email regarding possible settlement to the Parties on August 3, 2026. However, Complainant did not request a suspension for settlement talks.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on August 19, 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

Complainant is a privately held corporation headquartered in Hanover, Maryland. One of Complainant's core operating businesses is TEKsystems, Inc., an IT staffing and technology solutions company that has provided technology talent and managed services to a wide variety of organizations for many years.

Complainant's wholly-owned subsidiary owns several registrations in the United States for the TEKSYSTEMS marks including for example United States Trademark Registration No. 2287071, registered in classes 35 and 42 on October 19, 1999.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2025, and does not resolve to active content beyond a link and a landing page promoting Gamma, an AI design tool.

As noted above, Respondent sent the Center an email on June 25, 2026. Respondent's email wrote, in pertinent part:

"I confirm that I will no longer be using the domain name and will discontinue any plans associated with it."

"At this time, I do not intend to contest the Complaint."

Respondent also sent to the Center on July 20, 2026, an email annexing a copy of the Center's Model Response template in blank form; it had not been filled out with any facts, arguments, or particulars and contained no annexes or exhibits.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Complainant also notes that there is an active Mail exchange (MX) record associated with the disputed domain name and speculates (but provides no evidence) that Respondent might use it to send and receive fraudulent emails using the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

Respondent's communications and Responses are described above.

6. Discussion and Findings

In the context of Complainant's formal request to transfer submitted in the Complaint, the Panel construes Respondent's informal response email (stating that he would not contest the Complaint) and Respondent's blank Model Response filed July 20, 2026, as Respondent's consent to transfer the disputed domain name.

Rule 10(a) gives panels the discretion to conduct proceedings in such manner as they deem appropriate under the Policy and the Rules. Under Rule 10(c), the Panel must “ensure that the proceeding takes place with due expedition”.

The Panel concludes that Respondent’s consent provides a basis for an immediate order for transfer.

Where the complainant has sought transfer of a disputed domain name, and the respondent consents to transfer, then pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Rules the panel can order transfer and it is unnecessary for the panel to determine whether complainant has established its entitlement to transfer under paragraph 4(a) of the Rules. E.g., *The Cartoon Network LP, LLLP v. Mike Morgan*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-1132](#) (where complainant sought transfer of the disputed domain name, and respondent consented to transfer, paragraph 10 of the Rules permit a panel to proceed immediately to make order for transfer without determination of elements of paragraph 4(a)), citing *Williams-Sonoma, Inc. v. EZ-Port*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0207](#).

This is clearly the most expeditious course.

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 <global-teksystems.cloud> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/

Jeffrey D. Steinhardt

Sole Panelist

Date: August 22, 2026