

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TMII Enterprises, LLC dba A1 Garage Door Service v. Hasan Bepari, Hij Leadgen
Case No. D2026-3036

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TMII Enterprises, LLC dba A1 Garage Door Service, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Foley & Lardner LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Hasan Bepari, Hij Leadgen, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <a1garagedoorrepairmountlaurel.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 9, 2026. On July 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On that same day, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 13, 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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Philippe Gilliéron 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 provides garage door repair and installation services in the United States since 2007, including emergency repairs, routine maintenance, and sales and installation of new garage doors and controllers.

The Complainant operates numerous brick-and-mortar locations throughout the United States, including longstanding locations in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. From 2022 to 2025, its revenues exceeded USD 500 million.

Over the years, the Complainant has invested significant resources in local markets through television and radio ads, billboards, and extensive digital advertising on social media platforms, at a cost overall exceeding USD 40 million.

The Complainant owns the United States combined trademark A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE no. 7746740, that was registered on April 1, 2025 with a priority date as of June 1, 2015 in class 37.

The Complainant has continuously and exclusively owned and operated a website using the domain name <a1garage.com> since 2006 where it promotes its garage door sales, repair and installation services under the A1 and A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE marks.

On June 25, 2026, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name leads to a website that purports to offer garage door repair services in the area of Mount Laurel, New Jersey, United States, using the terms “A1” and “A1 Garage Door Repair” on numerous occasions.

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, as a result of its uninterrupted use and substantial advertising investments, it enjoys common law trademark rights in the terms A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE and A1 GARAGE DOOR REPAIR SERVICE. Consequently, the Complainant is of the view that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its common law and federal trademark rights as the geographically descriptive term “mount laurel” does not prevent confusing similarity.

The Complainant then affirms that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as it is not known under that name and has never been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademarks in any way. The offering of competing services under the terms “A1 Garage Door Repair Service” cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The Complainant finally believes that that disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The circumstances of the case highlight the fact that the Respondent “intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users” to the disputed domain name “by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant-A1’s Service Marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement”. In doing so, the Respondent was obviously aware of the Complainant’s trademarks when it chose to register the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “[...] decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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.

In light of its continuous, uninterrupted use of the trademarks “A1” and “A1 GARAGE DOOR SERVICE” since at least 2015, alone or combined with other word and design elements, in providing garage door sales, repair, and installation services, as well as the significant advertisement investments carried out over the years, the Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

The Complainant has further shown registered 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 the mark is recognizable 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 “mount laurel”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 provision of competing services to the Complainant’s ones in the area of Mount Laurel under the brand A1, further using the terms “Garage Door Repair” in direct connection with the sign A1 cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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 Respondent was obviously aware of the Complainant’s trademarks when it registered the disputed domain names, as such a choice cannot be a pure coincidence but rather reflects a deliberate intent to appropriate the Complainant’s trademark in an illegitimate way, particularly noting the promotion of the A1 brand to offer competing services on the website at the disputed domain name.

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.

The circumstances of the case highlight the fact that, as set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website at the disputed domain name.

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 <a1garagedoorrepairmountlaurel.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Philippe Gilliéron/

Philippe Gilliéron

Sole Panelist

Date: August 14, 2026