ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Cofactr Inc. v. Falaw Todd, FalawTodd
Case No. D2026-4340

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cofactr Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Cofactr Inc., United States.

The Respondent is Falaw Todd, FalawTodd, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cofacrt.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 25, 2026. On September 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 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 (Unknown Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 October 6, 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 October 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on October 30, 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 provides an online software platform and related services for supply-chain and inventory management in the hardware-manufacturing sector. The Complainant has used the COFACTR mark in commerce since at least March 18, 2021, and operates its legitimate website and email infrastructure through the domain name <cofactr.com>.

The Complainant owns United States Trademark Registration No. 7,974,229 for the standard-character mark COFACTR. The registration was issued on October 7, 2025, on the Principal Register, and covers "Providing an online, non-downloadable subscription-based computer software platform for managing supply chain and inventory for use in the hardware manufacturing sector" in International Class 42.

The disputed domain name is a typographical variant of COFACTR and the Complainant's legitimate domain name <cofactr.com>. It transposes the adjacent letters "t" and "r".

The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the COFACTR mark, register the disputed domain name, contact Cofactr customers, or distribute payment instructions in Cofactr's name.

On September 24, 2026, the same date the disputed domain name was registered, the disputed domain name was used to impersonate Cofactr's Head of Finance in a customer invoice discussion. The sender copied the genuine employee's name, title, signature, contact details, business address, and Cofactr branding; referenced a real invoice; represented that Cofactr had changed its banking details; supplied replacement banking instructions; and requested confirmation after payment. The communication copied "[…]@cofacrt.com" and "[…]@cofacrt.com" to reinforce the impersonation.

The customer did not transfer funds using the fraudulent instructions.

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 Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant in a fraudulent scheme to extract funds from the Complainant's customers.

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 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 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. The disputed domain name, <cofacrt.com>, is a typographical variant of COFACTR and the Complainant's legitimate domain name, <cofactr.com>. It transposes the adjacent letters "t" and "r," leaving the COFACTR mark readily recognizable.

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 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed passing off or impersonation as part of a fraudulent scheme, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name as part of a fraudulent scheme to extract money from the Complainant's customers.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed passing off as part of a fraudulent scheme, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <cofacrt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/
Elizabeth Ann Morgan
Sole Panelist
Date: November 9, 2026