ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Meyer Sound Laboratories, Incorporated v. BHAV Group
Case No. D2026-4148

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Meyer Sound Laboratories, Incorporated, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Beeson Skinner Beverly, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is BHAV Group, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <meyersounds.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 16, 2026. On September 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 17, 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 (Redacted For Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 21, 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 amended Complaint on September 22, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrice Bircker 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, Meyer Sound Laboratories, Incorporated, is a United States company active in the field of loudspeaker systems and active acoustics since 1979[1].

The Complainant is notably the owner of the MEYER SOUND United States trademark registration No. 2147717, with first use dating back to October 1981, filed on April 8, 1997, registered on March 31, 1998, and designating products of International Class 9.

The Complainant has also an online presence through the <meyersound.com> domain name.

This domain name was registered on February 2, 1995, and resolves to the Complainant's official website.

In addition, it is also used to host the Complainant's email addresses.

The disputed domain name, <meyersounds.com>, was registered on March 12, 2026.

According to the uncontested evidence on record, on the very same day the disputed domain name was registered, an email address associated with it was used in email invitations sent via Box and ClickUp impersonating an executive of the Complainant and inviting employees to engage via online collaboration platforms.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name seems to be inactive, likely having been suspended by the Registrar following a takedown request submitted by the Complainant.

Very little is known about the Respondent, except that, based on the information disclosed by the Registrar, it is apparently located in Germany.

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 MEYER SOUND trademark, as it incorporates the trademark in its entirety and differs from it only by the addition of the letter "s", which is insufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

---

[1] Some of this information was obtained by the Panel from the Complainant's website. Indeed, "[n]oting 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. This may include visiting the website linked to the disputed domain name in order to obtain more information about the respondent or its use of the domain name, consulting historical resources such as the Internet Archive (www.archive.org) in order to obtain an indication of how a domain name may have been used in the relevant past, reviewing dictionaries or encyclopedias (e.g., Wikipedia), or accessing trademark registration databases." WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.8.

Besides, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, in substance because:

- the Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the MEYER SOUND trademark, to register or use the disputed domain name, or to impersonate the Complainant or its personnel;

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any manner;

- there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name;

- the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; and

- the Respondent has not made any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, as the Respondent used it to impersonate an executive of the Complainant by sending fraudulent emails intended to deceptively induce employees to engage via online collaboration platforms.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith, notably because:

- the composition of the disputed domain name, which is an obvious variation of the Complainant's trademark and official domain name, together with its use by the Respondent to impersonate an executive of the Complainant, demonstrates that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name; and

- the use of a domain name for impersonation is manifest evidence of bad-faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

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 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the available record (Annexes E and F of the Complaint), the Panel finds that 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Indeed, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, only differing from it by the addition of the letter "s", and it is well established that "a domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element". WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

Finally, regarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name, it is well established that gTLDs do not generally affect the assessment of domain names for the purpose of determining identity or confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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.

Indeed, the Complainant has not given its consent to the Respondent to use its MEYER SOUND trademark in domain name registrations or in any other manner.

Furthermore, there is nothing in the record of the case to indicate that the Respondent may be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Finally, according to unrebutted explanations and supporting material provided by the Complainant, an email address associated with the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a fraudulent phishing scheme through email invitations sent via Box and ClickUp in which the Respondent impersonated an executive of the Complainant to induce employees to engage via online collaboration platforms.

In this respect, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (such as phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) 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

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 the present case, the Panel notes that:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior trademark;

- further, the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's prior domain name, which is used in connection with the Complainant's email addresses;

- the very same day of its registration, the disputed domain name was used for a phishing scheme through email-based impersonation, as the Respondent used it to send email invitations sent via Box and ClickUp fraudulently impersonating a Complainant's executive and seeking to induce its recipient to access online collaboration platforms; and

- the Respondent has remained silent despite having been notified and invited to participate in these proceedings.

It necessarily results from the above findings that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name being fully aware of the Complainant's prior rights, and intentionally used it in an attempt to deceive third parties by fraudulently impersonating a Complainant's executive.

In this respect, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (such as phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Finally, the fact that the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith, noting the use for illegitimate activity as described above.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 name <meyersounds.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrice Bircker/
Fabrice Bircker
Sole Panelist
Date: November 10, 2026