

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Signal Technology Foundation, Signal Messenger, LLC v. John Blackmon
Case No. D2026-3351

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Signal Technology Foundation and Signal Messenger, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by IPLA, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is John Blackmon, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <signal-messenger.org> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 29, 2026. On July 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 31, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on August 4, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on August 5, 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 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 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown 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 Complainants are related entities. Signal Messenger, LLC is a subsidiary of Signal Technology Foundation. The Complainants provide secure messaging software and related services under the SIGNAL mark. Signal Technology Foundation owns the SIGNAL mark, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration, including United States Registration No. 5,230,850, registered on June 27, 2017. The Complainants use the domain name <signal.org> for their official website and make the Signal private messaging application available there.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 14, 2026.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that prominently displays the SIGNAL mark and the heading “Download Signal Private Messenger”, uses Signal branding and product imagery, and offers links for downloading purported Signal software. The Windows download button on the website links to a URL that includes the disputed domain name, while the Complainants’ official Windows download button links to an address at “updates.signal.org”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainants have rights; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Complainants request transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant Signal Technology Foundation.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants’ contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainants must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have 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. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainants have rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

Signal Technology Foundation has demonstrated rights in the SIGNAL mark by providing evidence of its trademark registration, including United States Registration No. 5,230,850, registered on June 27, 2017. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the SIGNAL mark in its entirety with the addition of the term “-messenger”, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the SIGNAL mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The SIGNAL mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name.

It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant’s trademark to disregard the applicable Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) extension. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. Accordingly, the “.org” extension is disregarded here.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainants have made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainants make that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent, with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainants. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

On this point, the Complainants assert, among other things, that: (1) they are not aware of any trademark, domain name, or other rights held by the Respondent relating to the SIGNAL mark; (2) they have not authorized the Respondent to use the SIGNAL mark in connection with any goods or services; (3) nothing in the Respondent’s registration information or other publicly available information suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name; and (4) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Complainants assert that the website associated with the disputed domain name is misleading as to source or sponsorship, duplicates their official website, and provides links to the Complainants’ applications as well as an unauthorized download option purportedly for the Complainants’ Windows software.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this showing, and nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent’s favor.

Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name and the use shown in the record do not support a finding of fair use. The disputed domain name combines the SIGNAL mark with the term “messenger”, and the associated website presents itself as a website for downloading the Complainants’ Signal messaging software. Such use suggests affiliation with the Complainants rather than distinguishing the Respondent from them. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5 and 2.5.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainants have established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires the Complainants to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The circumstances described in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are non-exhaustive. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainants and the SIGNAL mark. The registration of the SIGNAL mark predates the Respondent’s January 14, 2026, registration of the disputed domain name by several years. More significantly, the composition of the disputed domain name and the Respondent’s subsequent use leave no plausible doubt

that the Respondent was targeting the Complainants. The disputed domain name combines the SIGNAL mark with the term “messenger”, and the associated website prominently uses the SIGNAL mark and Signal branding while presenting itself as a website from which users can download Signal messaging software. The record further shows that the website offered a Windows download link to a path at the disputed domain name rather than to the Complainants’ official download address.

The same record also establishes bad faith use. The Respondent used the disputed domain name and associated website in a manner calculated to create the false impression that the website was operated, sponsored, or authorized by the Complainants. The nature of the disputed domain name, the content of the associated website, and the clear targeting of the Complainants support a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1 and 3.2.1.

The Respondent has provided no explanation for this conduct. On the record before it, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainants have established this third element under 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 <signal-messenger.org> be transferred to Signal Technology Foundation.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2026