

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Docsketch, LLC (DBA SignWell) v. Xavier Mcguire Alec Berg, Osborn
Mcconnell Associates
Case No. D2026-2763

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Docsketch, LLC (DBA SignWell), United States of America ("US"), internally represented.

The Respondent is Xavier Mcguire Alec Berg, Osborn Mcconnell Associates, Finland.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <signwell-documents.com>, <signwell.live>, and <signwlls.com> (the "Domain Names") are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., 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 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On June 26, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for all the three disputed Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 26, 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 and amendment to the Complaint on June 26, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and 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 the 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. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant operates its electronic-signature platform through “www.signwell.com” and uses SIGNWELL as its business name, product name, and service mark.

The Complainant owns US trademark registration no. 8,124,970 (registered on February 3, 2026).

The Domain Names were registered on May 27, 2026, June 15, 2026, and June 17, 2026. The Complainant documents that the disputed domain name <signwlls.com> has been referenced in a phishing email impersonating the Complainant and inviting the recipient to open a document allegedly available on the website at that Domain Name. At the time of this Decision, the Domain Names resolve to error pages.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that that the Domain Names are under common control of the same person or entity and should be consolidated in the same proceedings. As the Registrar has confirmed that the Domain Names are registered by the same registrant, this argument is redundant.

The Complainant has registered trademark rights in SIGNWELL. The Complainant also asserts common-law trademark rights established through continuous commercial use in the electronic-signature and document-signing industry since at least 2021, see *Docsketch, LLC (DBA SignWell) v. Code Lynk*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2506](#). The Complainant argues the disputed domain name <signwell.live> is identical and the other Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s SIGNWELL trademark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. The Respondent is not known as SignWell, Signwlls, or SignWell Documents. The Respondent has no authorization, license, business relationship, or permission from the Complainant to use the SIGNWELL name or to register any domain name that contains or imitates SIGNWELL. The Respondent is not an employee, contractor, partner, reseller, distributor, representative, or authorized service provider of the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by any of the Domain Names. There is also no evidence that the Respondent used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before notice of this dispute. The Respondent has used at least one of the Domain Names to set up an e-mail account used for phishing.

The Complainant argues that the composition of the Domain Names demonstrates that the Respondent knew of and deliberately targeted the Complainant. The registration of the Domain Names within approximately three weeks further demonstrates a coordinated pattern of targeting the Complainant. One disputed domain name has been used to send an email purporting to originate from or be associated with the Complainant, in order to deceive the recipient. The Domain Names create a likelihood of confusion regarding source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established registered trademark rights in the SIGNWELL trademark. One of the Domain Names incorporates the Complainant's trademark without alterations, and is as such identical to the Complainant's trademark. The second disputed domain name adds "-documents" to the Complainant's trademark and the third disputed domain name has minor misspellings to the Complainant's trademark. The addition and the misspellings do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may disregard the Top-Level Domains. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

Based on the available record, 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. While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Names or names corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the use of one of the Domain Names for an e-mail used for phishing is clear evidence of bad faith, see below. Finally, the composition of the Domain Names signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites; use of one of the Domain Names in furtherance of a phishing scheme affirms this finding.

Based on the available record, 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.

The composition and use of the Domain Names prove that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered them. The use of one of the Domain Names for phishing purposes is clear evidence of bad faith under the Policy. As regards the domain names <signwell-documents.com> and <signwell.live>, their non-use would not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case where the Respondent has clearly sought to target the Complainant.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The third element of the Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders the Domain names <signwell-documents.com>, <signwell.live>, and <signwlls.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2026