

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Virtual Coworker INC v. Clinton Oladeji, Virtual Coworker  
Case No. D2026-3241

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Virtual Coworker INC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Clinton Oladeji, Virtual Coworker, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <virtualcoworkerhr.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 23, 2026. On July 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 (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 August 4, 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 August 5, 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 August 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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 virtual staffing and outsourcing company that has operated continuously since 2011. The Complainant has spent over 14 years building substantial goodwill and brand recognition in the VIRTUAL COWORKER mark throughout the United States and internationally, placing virtual assistants across industries including executive support, digital marketing, web development, and finance and human resource ("HR") roles, sourcing talent from a global pool in the Philippines.

The Complainant has a trade mark registration for the following VIRTUAL COWORKER mark:

- United States Registration No. 4443784 for VIRTUAL COWORKER in Class 35, registered on December 3, 2013.

The Complainant operates a website using the <virtualcoworker.com> domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 31, 2026. The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name has been used as part of email addresses to send false job offers.

#### **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 registered by the Respondent is confusingly similar to the Complainant's VIRTUAL COWORKER mark, and that the addition of the term "hr" – which is a common abbreviation for the human resources function the Respondent is impersonating, only increases the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the VIRTUAL COWORKER mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or has undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, as the Complainant further contends, the Respondent has used it to solicit personally identifiable information and, per the related pattern evidence, banking and credit-card details from victims, while misleadingly diverting job applicants through impersonation.

The Complainant also claims that there is no evidence that the Respondent has any connection to the VIRTUAL COWORKER mark, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name must be in bad faith.

##### **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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the VIRTUAL COWORKER trade marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", the disputed domain name is comprised of the term "virtualcoworker", which incorporates the Complainant's VIRTUAL COWORKER trade mark in its entirety. The inclusion of the term "hr" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the VIRTUAL COWORKER trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark.

### 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 proof on this element shifts to the respondent, who must then 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 submit 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 disputed domain name has been used to impersonate the Complainant's identity and perpetrate email scams linked to fake job opportunities.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed impersonation, passing off and employment fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Finally, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's trademark VIRTUAL COWORKER in its entirety with the addition of the term "hr", (a common acronym for "human resources") carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the foregoing and as well as the Panel's findings below, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances in particular, but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the registration of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's VIRTUAL COWORKER trade mark, indicates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its trade mark rights. The disputed domain name was registered thirteen years after the Complainant first established rights in its mark. The Panel finds it improbable that the Respondent was not aware of the VIRTUAL COWORKER mark and the Complainant's trading names, since an Internet search would have quickly revealed the existence of the VIRTUAL COWORKER mark and the Complainant's trading name and services.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to perpetrate employment fraud by impersonating the Complainant and its hiring personnel to deceive third parties. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed impersonation, passing off and employment fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel therefore finds that the third and final element required under the Policy has been established.

### **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 <virtualcoworkerhr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Joseph Simone/*

**Joseph Simone**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2026