ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Squire Technologies, Inc. v. Stefon Barnes
Case No. D2026-3152

1. The Parties

Complainant is Squire Technologies, Inc., United States of America ("U.S." or "United States"), represented by 101domain.com, U.S.

Respondent is Stefon Barnes, U.S.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <getsquireapp.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 17, 2026. That same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent ("The RDAP server redacted the value)" and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 21, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 24, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on August 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Harrie R. Samaras as the sole panelist in this matter on August 26, 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

Complainant, founded in 2015, is a software company providing a business management system for barbers and shop owners. Complainant's software serves approximately 3,000 shops in over 1,000 cities across the world and securely processes over USD 1 billion in payments across the globe. Complainant owns multiple trademarks that it uses in conjunction with its software products and services, including the SQUIRE Mark or the "Mark" (U.S. Trademark Registration No. 5,169,439, registered on March 28, 2017).

Complainant's primary website, located at <getsquire.com>, provides a booking engine to connect small businesses with consumers ("The Essential APP for Every Barber!"). Complainant maintains an extensive brand portfolio of over 50 domain names consisting of country-code Top-Level Domain and generic Top-Level Domain variations of the SQUIRE Mark including <squire-app.com>, <getsquire.mobile>, <get-squire.com>, and <get-squire.mobile>. In addition to using "getsquire" in its domain names, Complainant uses that term in promoting its products and services on its website.

The Domain Name was registered on April 7, 2026. Respondent was using the Domain Name in a smishing scheme whereby it sent smishing text messages to Complainant's customers/members to goad them into claiming monetary business credits purportedly to be used towards Complainant's software (namely, "SQUIRE: We appreciate your membership! Here's a $500 credit to help your business succeed. […]"). The text messages had a link to a domain name which in turn was there to redirect customers/members to Respondent's website associated with the Domain Name (the "Website"), which impersonated Complainant's website (e.g., displayed the SQUIRE Mark), informed visitors that they have received $500 in "Squire Business Credits" and invited them to use those for premium profile upgrades.

The Domain Name now resolves to a webpage that states in relevant part: "Warning | Suspected Phishing | This website has been reported for potential phishing. Phishing is when a site attempts to steal sensitive information by falsely presenting as a safe source".

Once Complainant became aware of Respondent's Domain Name registration and use it filed an abuse complaint with the Registrar and hosting provider on April 10, 2026, providing screenshots of the texts received as well as the security warnings from several vendors. Complainant sent several follow up emails requesting that the Domain Name be immediately suspended and services be disabled. Aside from automated responses that Complainant's submissions were received or forwarded to Respondent for corrective action, the providers failed to intervene and Complainant filed this Complaint.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name incorporates the SQUIRE Mark and trade name Squire Technologies, Inc. (dba Get Squire since 2015) and combines it with the term "app" which relates to the mobile software consulting services Complainant's company is recognized for.

Complainant has not licensed nor allowed Respondent to use the SQUIRE Mark or trade name for any purpose. Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name, it has no registered trademarks using the term "squire," and it does not appear to have any legitimate connection to the Mark. The Domain Name was being used to deceive and prevent online consumers from navigating to Complainant's website at the <getsquire.com> domain name.

Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name because it is involved in a smishing campaign to extort Complainant's customers. Respondent is diverting potential customers away from Complainant's website to the Website with a Domain Name that is confusingly similar with the Mark and disrupting and tarnishing Complainant's business.

Respondent fraudulently used the Domain Name to confuse customers, who know the SQUIRE Mark and corporate name, into providing login information, illicit payments, and personal data. Since the registration of the Domain Name, Respondent has not used nor prepared to use it for any legitimate purpose, and misuses it primarily for the purpose of disrupting Complainant's business. By impersonating Complainant's website under the Mark and displaying identical products and services, Respondent was targeting Complainant's customers through copyright and trademark infringement. Respondent was using the Domain Name to appear as if the Website was managed by and/or affiliated with Complainant. Thus, the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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.

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 Domain Name. Accordingly, the 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, "get" and "app" 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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as smishing and 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 Respondent registered the Domain Name in bad faith because: (1) the Domain Name was registered many years after Complainant began doing business under the Mark and by then Complainant had established a reputation in the market place; (2) the Domain Name not only reproduces the Mark, it also adds the term "get" in front of the Mark and, as indicated above, Complainant's own primary domain name is <getsquire.com> and it promotes its products and services using "getsquire", also, the industry term "app" is added which reflects what Complainant sells and does; (3) Respondent targeted Complainant's customers/members in sending text messages to them containing a link redirecting to the Website; and (4) the Website reflected Complainant's Mark and invited visitors to use Squire Business Credits for premium profile upgrades. For all of these reasons it is more likely than not that Respondent knew of Complainant and its rights in the Mark when registering the Domain Name and proceeded to use it for smishing.

The Panel further notes that the Website has been reported for potential phishing.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as smishing and passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <getsquireapp.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Harrie R. Samaras/
Harrie R. Samaras
Sole Panelist
Date: September 2, 2026