

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Securitas AB v. Cong ty TNHH Thiet ke va Quang cao Tivatech, Le Hoang Tai

Case No. D2026-2700

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Securitas AB, Sweden, represented by ANNAM IP & LAW, Viet Nam.

The Respondents are Cong ty TNHH Thiet ke va Quang cao Tivatech ("the Respondent 1") and Le Hoang Tai ("the Respondent 2"), Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <securitaslonghai.co> is registered with Mat Bao Corporation (the "Registrar").

The disputed domain name <securitaslonghai.net> is registered with P.A. Viet Nam Company Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 22, 2026. On June 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 23 and 27, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the one of the named Respondents (Cong ty Co phan Bao ve Long Hai) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 30, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 3, 2026 in English. On June 30, 2026, the Center also notified the Complainant that according to the information that the Center has received from the Registrars, the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Vietnamese. Accordingly, the Center requested the Complainant to include a language request in an amended Complaint should it wish for English to be the language of the proceeding or to submit a Complaint translated into Vietnamese. The Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding in the amended Complaint filed on July 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”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondents in English and Vietnamese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 26, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on July 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Jacques de Werra as the sole panelist in this matter on August 11, 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 runs a leading global security services group from Sweden, operating in 44 markets and providing comprehensive protection solutions including electronic security, live security, and technology. In Vietnam, the Complainant collaborates with a Vietnamese company (Cong ty co phan dich vu bao ve Long Hai), specializing in providing professional security services. On December 31, 2009, that Vietnamese company (Cong ty Co Phan Dich Vu Bao Ve Long Hai) was granted a joint venture license from the Complainant by the competent authorities in Vietnam.

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks containing the word “Securitas”, including the following international trademarks (“the Trademark”):

- Word trademark SECURITAS No. 701362, registered on May 14, 1998, for various goods and services in classes 6, 9, 16, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 42, protected in multiple jurisdictions;
- Word trademark SECURITAS No. 883424, registered on October 31, 2005, for various goods and services in classes 6, 9, 14, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, and 45, protected in multiple jurisdictions; and
- Word trademark SECURITAS No. 1600801, registered on December 17, 2020, for various goods and services in classes 9, 11, 25, 38, 42, and 45, protected in multiple jurisdictions including Viet Nam.

Both disputed domain names direct to websites sharing almost identical content and commercial identity, displaying almost identical branding layouts, and text and refer to the same business entity: Cong ty Co phan Bao ve Long Hai. The websites feature information (including pictures) about security services (comparable to those offered by the Complainant) and include references to the Trademark of the Complainant.

The Respondent 1, which is the owner of the disputed domain name <securitaslonghai.co>, is a company offering IT services for the websites associated with the disputed domain names.

The Respondent 2, which is the owner of the disputed domain name <securitaslonghai.net>, is the legal representative of the company Cong ty Co phan Bao ve Long Hai (which means Long Hai Security Joint Stock Company in English). This company is presented on the websites associated with the disputed domain names.

The Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the company, Cong ty Co phan Bao ve Long Hai, operating the services featured on the websites associated with the disputed domain names on June 18, 2025, which did not trigger any reaction.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends in essence that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Trademark, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names particularly because there is no evidence that the Respondents have used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is there any evidence that the Respondents have been commonly known by the disputed domain names, knowing that the registration of the Trademark precedes the registration of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant claims that the Respondents have registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith because the Respondents were aware of the Complainant and of the Trademark when registering the disputed domain names, because the disputed domain names incorporate the Trademark in its entirety together with the term "longhair", corresponding to the name of the Complainant's operations in Viet Nam. Such composition cannot reasonably be explained as accidental, but instead evidences deliberate targeting of the Complainant, its trademark rights, and its business presence in Viet Nam. By such use, the Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the websites associated with the disputed domain names by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. There is no actual or business relationship, whether direct or indirect, between the Complainant, the Complainant's operations in Viet Nam, and the Respondents that could justify such registration or use. The Respondents' conduct therefore amounts to opportunistic bad faith, intended to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation and mislead Internet users in Viet Nam seeking the Complainant's security services.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural issues

6.1.1 Language of the Proceeding

Pursuant to paragraph 11 of the Rules, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the default language of the proceeding is the language of the registration agreement, subject to the authority of the panel to determine otherwise.

In this case, the Complainant has requested that the language of the proceeding be English for various reasons. The Complainant has specifically alleged without being contradicted by the Respondent that the original registration agreement for the disputed domain name <securitaslonghai.co> was made with a different registrar English, and the Complainant obtained the registrant contact details from this registrar in April 2026. In the light of this, the Panel determines that it is adequate that English shall be the language of the proceeding also taking into account that although the Center notified the Respondent of the commencement of the proceeding including the language of the proceeding in both English and Vietnamese, the Respondent, who has not taken part to the proceeding, has not claimed that Vietnamese shall be the language of the proceeding, and requiring a translation of the Complaint into Vietnamese would unnecessarily delay the proceeding and cause extra burden to the Complainant noting the circumstances of this case.

6.1.2 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the two disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that (as submitted by the Complainant (without being contradicted by the Respondent) both disputed domain names are subject to common control and form part of a single, unified bad-faith operation based on the following material evidence:

- Both websites associated with the disputed domain names refer to the same entity, i.e., the company "Cong ty Co phan Bao ve Long Hai". Both disputed domain names direct to websites sharing almost identical content and commercial identity, namely displaying almost identical branding, layouts, and text, and crucially, both sites explicitly present themselves to the public as the exact same business entity, i.e., the company "Cong ty Co phan Bao ve Long Hai".
- Both websites associated with the disputed domain names have some identical contact details and the same operational contact information (one phone number and one email address), whereby the hotline corresponds to the phone number recorded for the Respondent 2 in the WhoIs database. In addition, there is a direct relationship between the Respondent 2 and the company "Cong ty Co phan Bao ve Long Hai" whose information is presented on the websites associated with the disputed domain names. The disputed domain name <securitaslonghai.net> is registered under the Respondent 2 and the official corporate records demonstrate that the Respondent 2 is the legal representative of "Cong ty Co phan Bao ve Long Hai".
- The Respondent 1 is a company offering IT services, and appears to be the developer/designer of the websites associated with the disputed domain names according to the copyright notice presented thereon.

On this basis, the Panel considers that the disputed domain names are under common control so that it is justified to consolidate the disputes in one proceeding.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive issues

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 names. [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 Panel finds that the Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The panel notes that the disputed domain names contain after the Trademark the term “longhai” (as a suffix) which corresponds to one element of the name of the company with which the Complainant cooperates for its operations in Viet Nam. Although the addition of other terms 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 names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel consequently 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, which in this case consists of the misuse of the distinctive Trademark of the Complainant on the websites associated with the disputed domain names, featuring services that are similar to those offered by the Complainant, and displaying images of office buildings bearing the Trademark, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names contain after the Trademark the addition of the term “longhai”, which corresponds to one element of the name of the company with which the Complainant cooperates for its operations in Viet Nam. Therefore, the Panel finds that this additional term rather increases the risk of confusion with the Trademark because it corresponds to the name of the Complainant’s operations in Viet Nam, and Internet users may think the disputed domain names are connected to the Complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark by using the disputed domain names in connection with the websites featuring the Trademark for security services that are comparable to those offered by the Complainant, which constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, which in this case consists of the misuse of the distinctive Trademark of the Complainant on the websites associated with the disputed domain names, featuring services that are similar to those offered by the Complainant, and displaying images of office buildings bearing the Trademark, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under 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 names <securitaslonghai.co> and <securitaslonghai.net> be transferred to the Complainant

/Jacques de Werra/

Jacques de Werra

Sole Panelist

Date: August 27, 2026.