ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Barracuda Networks, Inc. v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD
Case No. D2026-2739

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Barracuda Networks, Inc., United States of America ("United States") represented by KXT LAW, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <barrcuda.com> is registered with Media Elite Holdings Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 24, 2026. On June 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 28, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response providing the registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name.

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 July 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 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 was established in 2003. It operates in the field of Information Technology security, networking and storage appliances, and cloud-based services. The Complainant's official website is located at the domain name <barracuda.com>, registered on April 8, 1998.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for BARRACUDA (the "BARRACUDA trademark") including the following representative registrations:

- the United States trademark BARRACUDA NETWORKS (word) with registration No. 3866379, registered on October 26, 2010 for goods in International Class 9, with claimed date of first use in commerce on January 1, 2002. The element "NETWORKS" in this trademark is disclaimed; and

- the United States trademark BARRACUDA (word) with registration No. 4715332, registered on April 7, 2015 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 41 and 42, with claimed dates of first use in 2002 and 2003.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 24, 2004. When an attempt is currently made to access it, several consecutive automatic redirects take place, and the visitor ultimately arrives at a gambling website.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name has been used for various purposes. Between 2004 - 2016, it was inactive or resolved to static landing pages, some of them blank, and others displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") links. In June 2026, the disputed domain name alternatively redirected to varying third-party websites, including landing pages with PPC links related to the Complainant's business, account-creation and credential collection pages, commercial pages, and security warnings pages.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that it has extensively used and advertised the BARRACUDA trademark and the corresponding domain name <barracuda.com> for many years, and they have become well known and recognised by consumers as designating the Complainant as the source of the goods and services offered under the BARRACUDA trademark.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its BARRACUDA trademark, because it incorporates the dominant and recognisable elements of the trademark. According to the Complainant, the omission of the letter "a" in the disputed domain name is a classic example of typosquatting and does not avoid the confusing similarity with the BARRACUDA trademark.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because the Complainant has never authorised it to use the BARRACUDA trademark or any domain name incorporating the trademark or its typographical misspelling. The Complainant adds that the Respondent is not its authorised reseller, distributor or agent, and is not commonly known as" Barrcuda".

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name for any bona fide offering of goods or services and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. Rather, the

Respondent is using a misspelled version of the Complainant's BARRACUDA trademark as a traffic-capture device to exploit mistaken users and route them into changing, deceptive, and potentially harmful online destinations. The Complainant states that these destinations use traffic captured through a typo of the Complainant's trademark to solicit user information, generate leads, and expose users to fraud, credential theft, malware exposure, and scareware-related harm. The Complainant points out that the Respondent's Barracuda-themed landing page with links including "Barracuda Spyware Firewall," "Barracuda Spam and Virus Firewall," and "Website Protection" shows that the Respondent is targeting the Complainant by invoking the subject-matter of the Complainant's cybersecurity goods and services.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It points out that the disputed domain name is not a distinct or coincidental term, but is an obvious one-letter typographical variation of the Complainant's BARRACUDA trademark, which the Complainant has used since December 2002, while the disputed domain name was registered in 2004 and updated on December 3, 2025. According to the Complainant, a later acquisition of a domain name may constitute the relevant registration event where the current respondent uses the domain name in bad faith. Thus, whether measured from the disputed domain name's original 2004 registration date or from any later acquisition by the Respondent, the record supports a finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name previously resolved to simple parked pages, and has recently been reconfigured for active deceptive redirection, which shows the Respondent's actual knowledge and intentional targeting of the Complainant. The Complainant maintains that the Respondent is using a one-letter typo of the BARRACUDA trademark, selected for its confusing similarity to the Complainant's trademark, to capture users seeking the Complainant and divert them to deceptive, commercial, and potentially harmful destinations.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the BARRACUDA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the BARRACUDA trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. As noted in section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, a domain name that consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognisable aspects of the relevant mark.

Considering the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BARRACUDA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. Therefore, 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 recognised 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 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 disputed domain name appears as an obvious and intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark, and the Respondent has not provided any alternative explanation for its composition. It is currently being used for redirection of visitors to various unrelated websites, including a landing page containing PPC links related to cybersecurity services, which are identical with or related to the Complainant's offerings. This supports a conclusion that the disputed domain name is being used to target the Complainant's trademark for attracting Internet users and exposing them to commercial PPC links to competing or unrelated services for commercial gain. Such use cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

The disputed domain name was originally registered in 2004, which is 11 years before the registration of the Complainant's trademark. As discussed in section 3.8.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, where a respondent registers a domain name before the complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels will not normally find bad faith on the part of the respondent. Here however, the Complainant submits that the registration of the disputed domain name was updated in December 2025, and that its use significantly changed and intensified in 2026. According to the Complainant, this is a sign that there was a recent change of control over the disputed domain name. Such situations are discussed in section 3.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, and there is a consensus among UDRP panelists that the transfer of a domain name registration from a third party to the respondent is not a renewal and the date on which the current registrant acquired the domain name is the date a panel will consider in assessing bad faith.

In this case, the Wayback Machine records[1] for the disputed domain name for the period between 2004 and 2016 show that in this period it was inactive or resolved to landing pages with various PPC links or with no content. The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that in 2026 the disputed domain name alternatively redirected to varying third-party websites, including landing pages with PPC links related to cybersecurity services, account-creation and credential collection pages, commercial pages, and security

[1] https://web.archive.org/web/20040000000000*/http://barrcuda.com/

warnings pages. This supports the Complainant's submission that the use of the disputed domain name has significantly changed and intensified in 2026 following a long period of negligible use, which in turn increases the likelihood that a change of control has taken place.

Considering the above and the specific circumstances of this case, and the fact that the Respondent has not provided any details about the date when it acquired the disputed domain name and has not denied the Complainant's contentions or evidence, the Panel finds on balance of probabilities that it is more likely than not that the Respondent has acquired the disputed domain name in bad faith in 2026 and many years after the Complainant commenced its cybersecurity business under the brand BARRACUDA and registered it as a trademark in 2010.

Furthermore, even if 2004 was considered as the relevant date of registration, the Panel would still find evidence of targeting, on the basis that anyone seeking to register "barracuda" under the ".com" TLD at that time would have immediately encountered that <barracuda.com> was already registered by the Complainant as far back as 1998 - which suggests awareness of and targeting of the Complainant. The Complainant further asserts that it had used the BARRACUDA mark since at least December 2002, thus prior to 2004.

In any event, the Panel reaffirms its view that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the current Respondent at a more recent date.

Therefore, the Panel will consider the Respondent's current conduct in assessing bad faith.

The disputed domain name is an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark and creates a risk of implied affiliation with it. It is currently being used to automatically redirect visitors to many different websites, including such containing PPC links related to the Complainant's business, as well as websites that appear to collect personal information or may be distributing malware. Such use of the disputed domain name illegitimately exploits the goodwill of the Complainant's BARRACUDA trademark and supports a conclusion that by acquiring and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to it and to competing or possibly dangerous third-party content by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the affiliation or endorsement by the Complainant of such content. This supports a finding of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

On this basis, 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 <barrcuda.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/
Assen Alexiev
Sole Panelist
Date: August 4, 2026