

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Swift Passport & Visa Services LLC v. Haris Bacic, GovSwift LLC
Case No. D2026-3373

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Swift Passport & Visa Services LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by McDonald Hopkins LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Haris Bacic, GovSwift LLC, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <govswift.com> is registered with eNom, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 29, 2026. On July 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 30, 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 (Whois Agent (559467283), Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 5, 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 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 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2026. The Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center on August 13, 2026. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on September 7, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 limited liability company founded in 2007, organized under the laws of the State of Illinois (United States), and headquartered in Chicago, Illinois. The Complainant offers SWIFT-branded services to individuals and corporate accounts, assisting clients in obtaining or renewing passports and visas through its offices in downtown Chicago and online at “www.swiftpassportservices.com”, registered on December 21, 2007 (the Complainant’s website). The Complaint attaches examples of marketing under the SWIFT marks through newsletters, blogs, and social media posts. On its website the Complainant lists a number of corporate clients served, including Google, Motorola, United Airlines, Amway, and the University of Michigan.

The Complainant holds the following United States trademark registrations:

Mark	Reg. Number	Reg. Date	International Class
SWIFT (word and design)	4751835	June 9, 2015 (application October 20, 2014; claimed first use in commerce September 24, 2014)	39
SWIFT (word)	7934241	September 9, 2025 (application September 13, 2024; claimed first use in commerce October 11, 2014)	39
SWIFT PASSPORT & VISA SERVICES (word) ¹	7934131	September 9, 2025 (application August 29, 2024; claimed first use in commerce October 11, 2014)	39

(The Complainant also cites applications to register SWIFTPASS as a word mark and composite mark, but these remain pending and post-date the registration of the disputed domain name).

The disputed domain name was created on December 12, 2023, and is registered to Haris Bacic, listing the organization GovSwift LLC, with a postal address in the State of New Mexico, United States, and a contact email address using the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website (the “Respondent’s website”) headed with a “GS GovSwift” logo followed by a “TM” symbol asserting common law trademark rights or a pending trademark registration application, with the tagline, “One Place for All Your Important U.S. Government Documents”. The site offers to help users complete applications for government documents such as “passports, Social Security updates, birth certificates, visa requests, and trusted traveler programs” specifically including United States Green Cards, Nexus, Sentri, Global Entry, US ESTA, and TSA PreCheck applications. The home page claims more than one million applications completed and 500,000+ “satisfied users”. A disclaimer on the site makes it clear that it is “a private service” not a government agency, but the site does not identify the website operator other than as “GovSwift”. The “Terms and Conditions” are putatively governed “by the laws of the jurisdiction in which Govswift [sic] operates”, but no jurisdiction is named. The site includes a webform and an email address for contact. The site promises that personal data submitted by users will be kept private and safe and secured by encryption.

The Panel notes that the online database of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) shows that Adverscale LLC, a New Mexico (United States) limited liability company, applied to register GOVSWIFT as a standard character mark, Serial Number 99673591, on February 27, 2026, in International

¹ The “PASSPORT & VISA SERVICES” portion of this trademark is disclaimed.

Class 42 for Software as a Service in connection with a website for obtaining and accessing government documents including passports and visas.² The application was examined by USPTO and published for opposition, and the Complainant in this proceeding filed an opposition, which is pending decision. The Panel notes that there is a LinkedIn social media profile in the name of the Respondent Haris Bacic identifying him as co-founder of Adverscale LLC.

The Panel also notes that the online database of the New Mexico Secretary of State lists GovSwift LLC as an active New Mexico limited liability company formed on May 13, 2024, and Adverscale LLC as an active New Mexico limited liability company formed on June 15, 2023.

The Complainant offers evidence of actual confusion in the form of emails from customers of the Respondent who believed that they were dealing with the Complainant, attempting to make requests or register complaints.

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 is confusingly similar to its SWIFT marks, incorporating the distinctive "swift" element in its entirety and using it to promote similar services. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no permission to use the Complainant's marks and is not using the term "swift" in the disputed domain name for a "bona fide" commercial offering but to create confusion and trade on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark. The Complainant argues that this represents bad faith misdirection of Internet users for commercial gain, as the Respondent had "constructive knowledge" of the Complainant's long-standing rights in the SWIFT marks when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent an email to the Center saying only that "our team is reviewing your request". The Respondent did not reply further or submit a formal Response.

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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered SWIFT marks listed above) for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the SWIFT word mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, as is the "swift" element of the SWIFT PASSPORT & VISA SERVICES word mark and the "swift" textual element of the

²Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8.

SWIFT composite mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the cited marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the abbreviation “gov” standing for “government”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 Complainant has no association with the Respondent, who appears to be using a confusingly similar domain name to advertise competing services. 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 Panel notes that the Respondent’s website appears to offer a commercial service of assisting users in applying for or renewing government documents including passports, visas, and other official travel documents, and that “GovSwift LLC” is listed on Trustpilot and on the Better Business Bureau, but the Respondent has not come forward with evidence of actually engaging in such a business, despite the expansive claim on its website of more than one million “applications completed”. The Respondent’s website does not identify the website operator beyond repeating the disputed domain name. Although the Panel finds a legal entity with a corresponding name listed in New Mexico, this entity is not named on the website, nor are any principals, nor is a physical location or telephone number mentioned. The site displays a trademark symbol, and there is a pending trademark registration application for GOVSWIFT (opposed by the Complainant), but that application was filed by a company different from the organization listed in the registration of the disputed domain name. In any event, a pending application would not suffice to establish “rights or legitimate interests” for Policy purposes.

In sum, the Respondent has not come forward to explain the relationships, if any, between the parties with possible interests in the disputed domain name or establish that it is doing business legitimately without targeting the reputation of a longer-established direct competitor. Taken altogether, in the circumstances of this case the Panel would expect the Respondent to come forward to provide an explanation or assert rights or legitimate interests. In the absence of this, on this record, the Panel cannot find that the Respondent has furnished “relevant evidence” to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case.

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. One such example, found in paragraph 4(b)(iv), is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to another site for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark.

That paragraph fits the present circumstances. The Complainant did not have a registered SWIFT word mark when the disputed domain name was registered, but the Complainant's composite mark prominently featuring the textual element "swift" has been registered since 2015, and the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine shows use of the Complainant's website since at least 2008. This mark and the word marks SWIFT and SWIFT PASSPORT & VISA SERVICES had been in use for nearly a decade before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the distinctive element "swift" and employed it to advertise, among others, precisely the same services offered by the Complainant.

As "swift" is a dictionary word, this would not necessarily be dispositive evidence of targeting were it not for the overlap of services with the Complainant's well-established, core online business. Putting aside the Complainant's argument for "constructive notice", which is not persuasive on its own in the context of the Policy provision requiring evidence of bad faith, it is improbable that the Respondent failed to discover that a long-established business was already offering the same online passport and visa services under the SWIFT moniker.

The documented actual confusion of customers demonstrates the closeness of the Parties' names in the same market. Moreover, the Respondent has not denied actual knowledge of the Complainant or offered a legitimate, alternative reason for choosing the disputed domain name. After replying to the Complaint with a message saying, "our team is reviewing your request", the Respondent has been silent.

The Panel finds on this record 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 <govswift.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2026