ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Equifax Inc. v. Jatin Sareen
Case No. D2026-2863

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Equifax Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Jatin Sareen, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <equifaxpro.com> is registered with HOSTINGER operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 2, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 6, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 8, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuri Chumak as the sole panelist in this matter on August 6, 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, Equifax Inc., is a global data, analytics and technology company. It provides information solutions to businesses, governments and consumers, as well as human resources business process automation and outsourcing services to employers.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for EQUIFAX, including:

- United States Registration No. 1,027,544 for EQUIFAX, registered on December 16, 1975, in Class 36;

- United States Registration No. 1,045,574 for EQUIFAX, registered on August 3, 1976, in Class 35; and

- United States Registration No. 1,644,585 for EQUIFAX, registered on May 14, 1991, in Classes 35, 36 and 42.

The Complainant has used the EQUIFAX mark since 1975. Prior UDRP panels have recognized the EQUIFAX mark as well known. See e.g.: *Equifax Inc. v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Babacan Gunduz*, WIPO Case No. D2021-3814.

The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <equifax.com>, which was created on February 21, 1995. The Complainant uses that domain name for its principal website.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 14, 2025.

The evidence submitted with the Complaint shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website that prominently displayed the EQUIFAX mark and logo and substantially reproduced the appearance and content of the Complainant's official website. The website displayed offers for consumer credit monitoring and identity theft protection products, subscription prices, "SIGN UP NOW" buttons, and offers relating to credit cards, personal loans, automobile loans, and insurance.

The source code for the website contained the comment "Mirrored from www.equifax.com/ by HTTrack Website Copier/3.x". The record also shows that mail exchange records were configured for the disputed domain name.

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 contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the EQUIFAX mark because it incorporates the mark in its entirety and adds only the term "pro". According to the Complainant, the addition of that term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The generic Top Level Domain ".com" should be disregarded for the purposes of the comparison.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the EQUIFAX mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any trademark rights corresponding to it. The Complainant submits that using the disputed domain name for a website that impersonates the Complainant and copies its official website does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's EQUIFAX trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the reproduction of its mark and official website, together with source code showing that the website was mirrored from the Complainant's website, establishes that the Respondent knew of and deliberately targeted the Complainant. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. The Complainant also relies on the configuration of mail exchange records for the disputed domain name as a further circumstance supporting bad faith.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "pro" 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for a copycat site, or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's EQUIFAX trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several decades. The Complainant's domain name, <equifax.com>, also predates the registration of the disputed domain name by approximately 30 years.

The website prominently displayed the EQUIFAX mark and logo and substantially reproduced the Complainant's official website. The source code expressly stated that the website had been mirrored from "www.equifax.com" using HTTrack Website Copier. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights.

On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Respondent operated the copycat website to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the EQUIFAX mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the services presented on it. This constitutes evidence of bad-faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not provided any explanation for its selection or use of the disputed domain name capable of displacing the inference arising from the composition of the disputed domain name, the copied website, and the source-code evidence.

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 a copycat site, and passing off, 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 name 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 name <equifaxpro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuri Chumak/
Yuri Chumak
Sole Panelist
Date: August 13, 2026