ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Centurion Trial Attorneys, APC v. Ryan Stinger
Case No. D2026-3742

1. The Parties

Complainant is Centurion Trial Attorneys, APC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Sul Lee Law, United States.

Respondent is Ryan Stinger, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <centuriontrialsattorneys.com> (hereinafter the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 21, 2026. On August 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 25, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 25, 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 August 29, 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 September 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on September 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on October 5, 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.

On October 23, 2026, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1 (the "Procedural Order"), inviting Complainant to clarify, with supporting evidence, its claimed unregistered trademark rights in CENTURION TRIAL ATTORNEYS and its claims regarding impersonation and actual consumer confusion, by October 28, 2026, and inviting Respondent to submit comments on Complainant's submission by November 4, 2026. The Procedural Order also extended the due date for the Decision to November 11, 2026. On October 28, 2026, Complainant submitted its response to the Procedural Order, including an amended petition and an unsworn declaration with exhibits. Respondent did not submit any comments.

4. Factual Background

Complainant, a law firm with an office in San Diego, California, United States, uses CENTURION TRIAL ATTORNEYS (hereinafter the "Mark") in connection with legal services, focusing on labor and employment disputes, with a first claimed use in commerce of January 13, 2021. Complainant promotes its services via the website associated with its domain name <centuriontrialattorneys.com>.

The Disputed Domain Name, which was registered on December 23, 2025, resolves to a webpage that displays "CENTURION TRIALS ATTORNEYS" and a stock photo of people reviewing a document together, a slogan "Justice served with integrity", and a "Contact Us" form.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends as follows, supported by a declaration[1] made by Complainant's principal attorney, Ryan Stygar and documents reflecting alleged fraud:

- Since January 13, 2021, Complainant has used the Mark in connection with legal services in labor, employment, and workers' rights law.

- Complainant operates a website at the domain name <centuriontrialattorneys.com>, where it promotes its legal services.

- On May 15, 2025, Complainant filed United States Trademark Application No. 99186401 to register the Mark with the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"). That application has been approved and published without any opposition being filed by the applicable due date (October 29, 2026) and, although it has not yet issued, registration should soon issue in due course.

- Complainant's principal attorney, Ryan Stygar, has received public exposure through social media websites, reaching an online audience of over 2,000,000 social media followers across platforms such as Instagram and TikTok using the handle @attorneyryan. On TikTok, Mr. Stygar describes himself as "CEO Centurion Trial Attorneys."

[1] Although not sworn, it is made under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746.

- Mr. Stygar has also written a book entitled *Get It in Writing* regarding labor and employment law.[2]

- On the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name, Respondent prominently displays the Mark and provides a mechanism for site visitors seeking legal services to leave their contact information.

- When this information is provided, Respondent then contacts unsuspecting consumers impersonating Complainant's principal attorney, Ryan Stygar, and collects money for legal fees from them.

- Complainant offers evidence of a fake retainer agreement that purports to engage Complainant, but, like the Disputed Domain Name, misspells the Mark, adding an "s" after "trial."

- Several people have contacted Complainant inquiring about the status of their matters after sending money to parties impersonating Complainant. In fact, at least four victims have contacted Complainant alleging to have sent money or been solicited to send money to Respondent.

- Complainant's online research could not locate a person with Respondent's name in the state of Missouri, United States, the state listed by Respondent when it registered the Disputed Domain Name. Online research also revealed that the listed address for the Disputed Domain Name is the corporate headquarters for Lead Bank, and the listed phone number was seen on various sites offering escort services.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

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 Complainant's 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 finds Complainant has established unregistered trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.3.[3] Complainant's declaration demonstrates that Complainant has used the Mark continuously for more than five years, and the failure of any person to file an opposition to Complainant's application to register the Mark is evidence of substantially exclusive use, during this period. In addition, Complainant's social media evidence supports a finding of substantial consumer awareness. Respondent's targeting of Complainant is also evidence that Respondent itself recognized that consumers recognized the Mark as a specific source of legal services. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.3. The fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting the complainant's mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the mark is used on the related website or impersonating documents or other instruments) may also support the complainant's assertion and evidence that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier.

---

[2] The audio book was published in May 2026 by Penguin Audio, which, based on the Panel's research, uses the Mark when it promotes the book online, noting that "Stygar is the founder and lead counsel of Centurion Trial Attorneys […]." (Last visited November 10, 2026.)

[3] Because Complainant's application to register the Mark has not issued, it is not sufficient to satisfy Policy paragraph 4(a)(i). WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.1.4. However, the Panel notes that the USPTO approved the application and no opposition proceeding was commenced by the applicable due date (October 29, 2026). Consequently, although it has not yet issued, registration should soon issue in due course.

The Panel finds the Mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name, which reflects a deliberate and inconspicuous variation of the Mark (merely adding an "s" to the word "trial"), which variation is especially inconspicuous because it merely adds a letter to the middle of Complainant's 23-character domain name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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 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 Disputed 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 Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for, as here, passing off and fraudulent impersonation, 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.

The Panel finds that Respondent targeted the Mark when it registered the Disputed Domain Name, which it has used to impersonate Complainant to confuse and defraud Internet users for commercial gain. The Panel finds that, based on the balance of probabilities, Respondent used false contact information when it registered the Disputed Domain Name, inventing a false name ("Ryan Stinger") that was similar to Complainant's principal attorney ("Ryan Stygar"). This deliberate imitation of Mr. Stygar's name is evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant when it registered the Disputed Domain Name. Targeting at the time of registration may also be inferred from Respondent's making only inconspicuous changes to the Mark designed to evade detection by all but the most vigilant Internet visitors.

The Panel also finds bad faith use of the Disputed Domain Name based on Respondent's deceptive impersonation of Complainant when it fraudulently deceived Complainant's potential clients into sending money. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such fraud constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed 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 Disputed Domain Name <centuriontrialsattorneys.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/
Lawrence K. Nodine
Sole Panelist
Date: November 10, 2026