ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Equifax Inc. v. Renaissance Academy and Renaissace Academy, Renaissace Academy
Case No. D2026-2994

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Renaissance Academy, India, and Renaissace Academy, Renaissace Academy, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <career-equifax.com> and <equifax-hiring.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc., and the disputed domain name <careers-equifax.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (collectively the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 8, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 8 and 9, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 9, 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 domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 9, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondents sent an email communication to the Center on July 10, 2026. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the commencement of panel appointment process on August 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Igor Alfiorov as the sole panelist in this matter on August 7, 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 is Equifax Inc., a global data, analytics, and technology company originally incorporated in the State of Georgia, United States, in 1913, with roots dating back to 1899. The Complainant is the New York Stock Exchange listed company and operates a business with approximately 15,000 employees, providing information solutions and human resources business process outsourcing services worldwide.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in many jurisdictions worldwide for marks consisting of, or incorporating, the term “equifax”. The EQUIFAX mark was first used in commerce and registered in 1975. Among these registrations are the following trademarks in the United States:

- U.S. Trademark Registration No. 1,027,544, registered on December 16, 1975, in Class 36;
- U.S. Trademark Registration No. 1,045,574, registered on August 3, 1976, in Class 35; and
- U.S. Trademark Registration No. 1,644,585, registered on May 14, 1991, in Classes 35, 36, and 42.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <equifax.com>, registered on February 21, 1995, which hosts its primary corporate website.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

- <careers-equifax.com> on June 12, 2026;
- <career-equifax.com> on June 17, 2026; and
- <equifax-hiring.com> on July 1, 2026.

At the date of this Decision, none of the disputed domain names resolve to an active website. However, the case record contains uncontested evidence that indicates that the disputed domain names have been used as active email servers to send fraudulent job offers and technical interview follow-ups to job seekers under the guise of the Complainant’s “Talent Acquisition Team” (e.g., from “[…]@career-equifax.com”, “[…]@careers-equifax.com”, and “[…]@equifax-hiring.com”) to harvest sensitive personal details.

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.

First, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its distinctive and well-known EQUIFAX trademark. Each of the disputed domain name incorporates the trademark in its entirety alongside descriptive terms ("career", "careers", and "hiring") separated by a hyphen, which does not prevent confusing similarity.

Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondents possess no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not licensed or authorized to use the EQUIFAX mark, are not commonly known by any of the disputed domain names, and have used the disputed domain names exclusively to facilitate an illegitimate employment phishing scam to harvest personal data, which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Third, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Respondents deliberately targeted the Complainant's famous mark to conduct deceptive job phishing scams. The Complainant also points out that the Respondents have engaged in an abusive pattern of bad faith conduct, having previously targeted other brands, having been subject to a prior UDRP dispute.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not submit a Response to the Complainant's contentions.

However, the Respondents sent an informal email to the Center on July 10, 2026, stating: "Hi, we would love to return this domain to the rightful user. Please let us know if we can go ahead with it."

6. Discussion and Findings

A. 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 the same entity. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple 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.

The Panel notes that the Registrar verification data reveals the following commonalities across all three disputed domain names:

- All registrants share the same email address;
- All registrants share the same phone number;
- All registrants share substantially the same postal address; and
- The names "Renaissance Academy" and "Renaissace Academy" are virtually identical, save for a minor typographical variation.

These factors demonstrate that the disputed domain names are subject to common control. Furthermore, the Panel finds that consolidation is fair, equitable, and procedurally efficient to all Parties. 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.

B. Consent to Transfer

The Panel notes that the Respondent has explicitly consented on the record to the transfer at least one of the disputed domain names to the Complainant, stating: "we would love to return this domain to the rightful user".

Under WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.10, where a respondent has consented to the transfer remedy sought by the complainant, panels will typically order the requested remedy solely on the basis of such consent in the interest of procedural efficiency. However, given the wording of the Respondent's communication, and noting that said communication seemed not to refer to both disputed domain names, , the Panel deems it appropriate to review the three substantive elements of the Policy.

C. 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 each of the disputed domain names incorporates the Complainant's registered EQUIFAX trademark in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive terms "career", "careers", and "hiring" separated by hyphens does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a technical registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established an unrebutted prima facie case. The Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, has no trademark rights in equifax, and is not commonly known by any of the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, the undisputed evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to operate email servers to send fraudulent job offers under the guise of the Complainant's recruitment team to harvest sensitive personal data from job seekers. Under WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1, panels categorically hold that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing and impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel therefore finds that the second element of the Policy is satisfied.

E. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Given the global fame of the EQUIFAX trademark, which has been registered and used for decades, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. This is reinforced by the disputed domain names' composition, namely combining the Complainant's well-known mark with descriptive, employment-related terms ("career", "careers", and "hiring") separated by hyphens, which demonstrates a deliberate targeting of the Complainant's mark and business sector. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1).

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to execute a phishing scam by impersonating the Complainant and targeting job seekers with fraudulent job offers to harvest personal credentials represents a paradigm case of bad faith use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

The fact that the disputed domain names do not currently resolve to active websites does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The Respondent did not file a Response to contest any of these serious claims of fraudulent activity. Instead, the Respondent explicitly offered to return at least one of the disputed domain names, leaving the Complainant's evidence-backed allegations of bad faith registration and use entirely uncontested.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith, satisfying 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 <career-equifax.com>, <careers-equifax.com>, and <equifax-hiring.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Igor Alfiorov/
Igor Alfiorov
Sole Panelist
Date: August 21, 2026