

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Carvana, LLC v. haris syed, Brian Schneider, John Marshall, Isaac Bentley
Case No. D2026-3321

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Carvana, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

The Respondents are haris syed, United States, Brian Schneider, United States, John Marshall, United States, and Isaac Bentley, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <milford-carvana-cars.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB. The disputed domain names <milford-carvanacars.com>, <milfordcarvana-cars.com> and <milford-carvana-cars.sale> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (collectively, the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 27, 2026. On July 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 29, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrants and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (UNKNOWN/REDACTED FOR PRIVACY/The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 29, 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 amended Complaint on August 1, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on August 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on September 1, 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 an e-commerce platform for buying and selling used cars and owns numerous trademark registrations for the trademark CARVANA such as:

- United States trademark registration No. 4,328,785, registered on April 30, 2013; and
- United States trademark registration No. 5,022,315, registered on August 16, 2016.

The disputed domain name <milford-carvana-cars.com> was registered on November 28, 2025 and does not resolve to an active website. The disputed domain name <milford-carvana-cars.sale> was registered on May 8, 2026 and resolves to a website which purports to offer cars for sale. The disputed domain name <milford-carvanacars.com> was registered on May 19, 2026 and resolves to a website with the same or very similar layout which purports to offer cars for sale. The disputed domain name <milfordcarvana-cars.com> was registered on June 25, 2026 and does not resolve to an active website.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, which is a coined word and has been recognized as well known. The disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. The addition of the terms "milford" and "cars" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant has not given the Respondents authorization or license to use its trademark. The Respondents must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark as it is well known. There is no evidence that Respondents are commonly known by the trademark CARVANA. The disputed domain names are either being used to host parked pages or in a manner which exploits the Complainant's trademark rights and misleads consumers. The trademark CARVANA is being used to create an impression of an association with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The disputed domain names are being used to redirect users from the Complainant's website and could be used for phishing personal information. The Respondents have no intellectual property rights in or to the disputed domain names. The Respondents were aware of the Complainant's trademark which was registered more than a decade before the earliest registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. The Complainant's trademark is well known and distinctive.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes 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.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that: 1) The composition of all the disputed domain names is very similar, consisting of the three words "milford", "carvana" and "cars"; 2) Three of the disputed domain names were registered within a short time frame from one another with two of them registered in May while the third in June 2026; 3) Three of the disputed domain names were registered with the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com"; 4) The websites associated with <milford-carvana-cars.sale> and <milford-carvanacars.com> listed the same business address which the Complainant claims is the actual address of its Inspection and Reconditioning Center. The former also displayed the contact email address "[...]@milford-carvana-cars.com", linking it to another disputed domain name. In addition, two of the Registrar-disclosed registrant email addresses share the string "3677"; 5) Three of the disputed domain names are registered with the same registrar, Nicenic International Group Co., Limited; 6) No response has been submitted in connection with any of the disputed domain names.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

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.

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 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 disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's CARVANA trademark in its entirety, and as such are confusingly similar to it. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “milford” and “cars” 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 names 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.

The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CARVANA trademark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names. Two of the disputed domain names have used the Complainant’s trademark for websites (which also displayed the trademark in the form of a logo “Milford Carvana Cars”) purporting to offer cars for sale. The use of the Complainant’s mark for a competing business offering does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Panel finds that all four disputed domain names were registered with an intention to trade on the goodwill inherent in the Complainant’s mark.

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 names. 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 names 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 the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark as the disputed domain names were registered more than a decade after the registration of the Complainant’s trademark and two of the disputed domain names resolve to websites purporting to offer cars for sale, i.e. the same service as the Complainant’s.

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.

In connection with the disputed domain names <milford-carvana-cars.com> and <milfordcarvana-cars.com>, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank 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 names and the Respondent's failure to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

In connection with the disputed domain names <milford-carvana-cars.sale> and <milford-carvanacars.com>, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship or affiliation of the websites. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute 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 names <milford-carvana-cars.com>, <milford-carvanacars.com>, <milfordcarvana-cars.com> and <milford-carvana-cars.sale> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: September 14, 2026