

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

NuScale Power, LLC v. John Doe
Case No. D2026-2996

1. The Parties

The Complainant is NuScale Power, LLC, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is John Doe, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nuscalepower-careers.com> is registered with Cloudflare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

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 Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 8, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 10, 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 on July 14, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on August 31, 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 a United States advanced nuclear technology company that designs and commercializes Small Modular Reactor (“SMR”) nuclear power plants. Founded in 2007, and headquartered in Corvallis, Oregon, United States, the Complainant is recognized as an innovator in the nuclear energy sector with a mission to advance safe, scalable and carbon-free nuclear power solutions.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations across various jurisdictions including the United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office (“UKIPO”), the European Union Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”), the Canadian Intellectual Property Office (“CIPO”), and the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”). The registered marks include but are not limited to: NUSCALE United Kingdom Registration No. UK00909673674 registered October 13, 2011 in classes 11, 35, 37, and 42; NUSCALE United States Registration No. 6859687 registered September 27, 2022 in classes 40, 41, and 42; and NUSCALE POWER European Union Registration No. 017980453 registered July 1, 2019 in classes 11, 35, 37, 40, 41, and 42.

The Complainant originated from research conducted at Oregon State University and Idaho National Laboratory and was initially funded by the U.S Department of Energy in 2002 for the commercialization of a new SMR concept. The Complainant’s flagship technology, the NuScale Power Module, is one of the first SMRs to receive design approval from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Online, the Complainant has provided information about its NUSCALE and NUSCALE POWER brand and products since June 25, 2007, from its main website “www.nuscalepower.com”. The Complainant has also registered their NUSCALE / NUSCALE POWER trademark in conjunction with a variety of relevant terms including but not limited to recruitment opportunities. According to Similarweb.com, the Complainant’s website at its primary domain name <nuscalepower.com> has received 108,806 visits in May 2026. Moreover, Similarweb.com ranks the Complainant’s <nuscalepower.com> as the 191,573rd most popular website in the United States, the 357,263rd globally and the 1,339th in its sector.

The Complainant has spent substantial time, effort, and money marketing and promoting NUSCALE and NUSCALE POWER, and claims to have thus developed substantial goodwill in the NUSCALE and NUSCALE POWER brand. By virtue of its 19 years in existence, the Complainant claims its NUSCALE and NUSCALE POWER marks are distinctive and uniquely associated with the Complainant and its products and services.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on April 11, 2026.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive site.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks in which Complainant has rights; the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant’s trademarks in any manner including in domain names.

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. The disputed domain name captures, in its entirety, the Complainant's NUSCALE and NUSCALE POWER trademarks and simply adding a hyphen and the term "careers" to the end of the trademark.

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, the term "careers" and a hyphen, 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.

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 by registering a domain name that comprises the entirety of the Complainant's trademark in conjunction with the term "careers" (which is suggestive of a recruitment website) and a hyphen, the Respondent has created a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and similar to its <nuscalepower.com> domain name. The Panel further notes that Respondent registered the disputed domain name significantly after the Complainant had obtained its registrations for NUSCALE and NUSCALE POWER trademarks with the UKIPO, EUIPO, CIPO, and USPTO. The registration of the disputed domain name also falls significantly after the Complainant's registration of its <nuscalepower.com> domain name on June 25, 2007. The Panel, finds, on balance, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark in mind.

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 found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and, in the absence of a response, finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <nuscalepower-careers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2026