ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Safelite Group, Inc. v. Jimmy Pompa, Danny Garza, ClaimIQX
Case No. D2026-3936

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Safelite Group, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by ZeroFox, United States.

The Respondents are Jimmy Pompa, United States, and Danny Garza, ClaimIQX, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <claimiqx.biz> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

The disputed domain name <claimiqx.com> 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 September 2, 2026. On September 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 3, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 7, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 17, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 12, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on October 18, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on October 27, 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 corporation established under Delaware (United States) law and headquartered in Columbus, Ohio, United States. The Complainant is a nationally advertised provider of vehicle glass repair and replacement services in the United States, functioning as part of the Belron group of companies and operating a website at "www.safelite.com". The Complainant's website promotes its service as available through more than 7100 locations and mobile shops in all 50 states of the United States, accessible to more than 97% of United States drivers. The Complainant has developed a proprietary AI (artificial intelligence) insurance claims administration application branded CLAIMS[IQX] to manage vehicle glass service and related automotive insurance claims.

The Complainant has applied to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) for registration of IQX and CLAIMS [IQX] as word marks in International Classes 36 and 42 on an intent-to-use basis, Serial Numbers 99743564 and 99743589, respectively, both on April 3, 2026. (The latter application disclaims the word "CLAIMS".) Those applications are pending at the time of this Decision.

The Complainant claims common law rights in CLAIMS[IQX], IQX, and CLAIMS IQX as marks predating the registration of the disputed domain names. The Complaint asserts that internal communications show that the Complainant's executives formally agreed on the brand name CLAIMS[IQX] at a meeting "on or around August 8, 2025". Until then, the platform under development had been referred to internally as "Solutions 2.0". A presentation was then made to the Belron Board of Directors in October or November 2025 on "The CLAIMS[IQX]™ Platform", and on December 1, 2025, documentation on the "Claims IQX Solution" and "CLAIMS[IQX] Platform" was circulated to "external business and technology partners. The Complainant registered a number of associated domain names in the first quarter of 2026, such as <claimsiqx.com> and <claimsiqx.ai>. The Complainant launched the platform and client terms and then onboarded insurance carriers in commercial pilot programs in March and April 2026 and also applied for United States trademark registrations as detailed above.

The disputed domain name <claimiqx.com> was registered on August 17, 2025, and is registered to the Respondent Jimmy Pompa, an individual, listing a postal address in the State of Texas, United States, with a Yahoo contact email address. This disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website at the time of this Decision. The Complainant attaches evidence showing that the disputed domain name is configured for MX (Mail Exchange) records so that it can be used for email accounts.

The disputed domain name <claimiqx.biz> was registered on August 25, 2025, and is registered to the Respondent Danny Garza, an individual, listing a postal address in the State of Texas, United States, with a Gmail contact email address. At the time of this Decision, this disputed domain name resolves to a landing page advertising Wix domain name and website building services. However, the Complaint attaches screenshots of the website to which the disputed domain name <claimiqx.biz> formerly resolved. This consisted of a landing page with the term CLAIMIQX and an electronic schematic logo, along with the tagline, "Intelligent Claim Processing", followed by a "Log In" button that led to a screen soliciting the site visitor's email address and password.

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 timeline outlined above shows that the Complainant "had adopted and was actively developing common law rights in the CLAIMS[IQX]™, IQX, and CLAIMS IQX marks no later than August 8, 2025 — nine days before the first disputed domain name was registered — and that those rights were substantially developed and commercially exploited in the months that followed." The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to those marks, combining the distinctive element "iqx" with the singular form of the word "claim".

The Complainant states that the Respondents are not authorized to use the Complainant's marks and that there is no evidence that the Respondents are known by a corresponding name or have used the disputed domain names for either a bona fide commercial offering or for a legitimate noncommercial fair use. To the contrary, the Complainant points to evidence of impersonation in the screenshots furnished with the Complaint and argues that the Respondents' removal of website content, while retaining the ability to use the disputed domain names for emails, positions the disputed domain names for use in phishing attacks. The Complainant asserts "upon information and belief" that both disputed domain names were formerly used for imitative websites as shown in the example for <claimiqx.biz> and suggests that the current non-use of both disputed domain names also represents "passive holding" consistent with WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1, and as further reinforced by the registration of more than one targeting domain name and the use of a domain privacy service.

B. Respondent

Neither of the Respondents of record replied to the Complainant's contentions. However, the Respondent Danny Garza sent an email to the Center on October 27, 2026, after the Center sent notice that the deadline for filing a Response had expired. Mr. Garza's email stated only that "these aren't my domains, they were purchased for someone else and are no longer needed". 6. Discussion and Findings

6a. Preliminary Matter: Consolidation

The Rules, paragraphs 3(c) and 10(e), grant the Panel authority to consolidate disputes involving multiple domain names or respondents. This is commonly done in the interest of procedural efficiency where the evidence indicates that the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control and the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.11.2.

The Complainant argues for consolidation in this case on the grounds that "these two domains are operated by the same person or entity based on the close proximity of their registration dates and identical typosquatting strategy." The two strings are identical apart from the generic top-level domain name ("gTLD"), and they were registered within eight days of each other, ostensibly by two different individuals. Only one of them, Mr. Garza, communicated with the Center, stating that both of the disputed domain names were "purchased for someone else and are no longer needed". Thus, there is some indication that the disputed domain names are under common control. No person has entered an objection to consolidation, and consolidation appears to be an efficient approach to the resolution of the dispute. Accordingly, the Panel will proceed to a decision with regard to both of the disputed domain names in this proceeding.

6b. Substantive Issues

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 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant's pending applications for registration in the United States cannot ground a UDRP Complaint, as they do not establish service marks in which the Complainant currently has rights. Policy paragraph 4(a)(i)); WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.1.4.

The Complainant claims unregistered service mark rights in CLAIMS[IQX], IQX, and CLAIMS IQX but offers little supporting evidence of market use and acquired distinctiveness. The Complaint recites a brief history of internal decision making and circulation to business partners, followed by a commercial pilot program in March and April 2026. The Complainant has recently registered several domain names incorporating the string "claimsiqx" and directed them to a website at "www.claimsiqx.com", headed "CLAIMS[IQX]™". The Complaint does not indicate how long this site has been published (the Panel notes the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine has no archived screenshots as of the time of this Decision[1]) and offers no information about related site visits or sales. The Panel notes that the pending trademark registration applications were filed on an intent-to-use basis, and the United States Patent and Trademark Office database does not yet indicate that the Complainant has filed a declaration of use. Generally, UDRP complainants asserting common law trademark rights must support their claims of acquired distinctiveness with evidence that is lacking on this record, such as proof of the volume and duration of sales and advertising under the mark, industry and media recognition, and consumer awareness, to show that the mark has become a source identifier associated with the complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.3.

Based on the limited record and available evidence, the Panel could not find support for a claim of common law rights in IQX or CLAIMS IQX. There are contentions of trademark use of CLAIMS[IQX], at least since the launch of "pilot programs" in March 2026 and a website, and evidence of such conceivably could support a finding of rights under the first element of the Complaint. This does not "predate" registration of the disputed domain names as the Complainant claims, and given the impact of these findings on the third element of the Complaint, it is not necessary to enter a definitive finding on the first element.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondents do not assert rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. However, given the Panel's findings on the third element of the Complainant, it is not necessary to enter a finding on the second element.

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. All of these, including paragraph 4(b)(iv) (creating confusion with the Complainant's trademark to attract Internet users for commercial gain) presume an intention to target the Complainant's mark.

---

[1] Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.8.

The Complainant infers that the Respondents somehow learned about the Complainant's internal decision to brand its planned insurance claims platform CLAIMS[IQX] and registered the first of the disputed domain names nine days after an internal meeting between the Complainant's executives, long before the name was shared with the board of directors, business partners, or the public, and long before the Complainant registered corresponding domain names or applied for trademark registration. The Respondents have not published an imitative website or engaged in known phishing attacks (the disputed domain name <claimiqx.biz> did at one point resolve to a login page but did not make use of the Complainant's purported CLAIMS[IQX] mark). The Complainant offers no proof of advance knowledge but relies on the similarity of the names.

While at first glance "iqx" appears to be a suspiciously distinctive string, the Panel notes that in fact it appears frequently in contexts not associated with the Complainant, and even where the word "claim" is potentially relevant. The WIPO Global Brand Database lists 72 registered IQX trademarks (of which only 10 belong to the Complainant), and a simple Internet search reveals the term in additional company and product or service names that do not necessarily correspond to registered trademarks. As "IQ" can refer to "intelligence quotient" and "x" is often used to refer to a new or unknown quantity, it is not surprising that this string appears in many software-based and particularly AI-powered applications. Thus, absent more direct evidence of insider knowledge or targeting of the Complainant, the Panel does not find the Complainant's argument convincing that the Respondents in this instance must have selected the disputed domain names because they somehow learned that the Complainant had internally decided to name an upcoming software application CLAIMS[IQX].

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondents' aim in registering the disputed domain names was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademarks.

Moreover, for the reasons detailed above in discussing the Complainant's claim to common law trademark rights under the first element of the Complaint, the Panel finds that the Respondents did not register the disputed domain names in bad faith targeting of the Complainant or its trademark rights because the Complainant had no trademark rights at the time that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.8.1.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/
W. Scott Blackmer
Sole Panelist
Date: November 5, 2026