ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Green Energy (UK) Limited v. matt taylor
Case No. D2026-4475

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Green Energy (UK) Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Stobbs (IP) Ltd, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is matt taylor, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <100green-uk.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 2, 2026. On October 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 5, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 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 amended Complaint on October 7, 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 October 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Dawn Osborne as the sole panelist in this matter on November 2, 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 an award-winning energy company in the United Kingdom which owns the trademark 100GREEN registered UK00003829806 for electricity and related services since December 2, 2022.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 18, 2026, and has been used for a fraudulent email scheme including fraudulent invoices using the Complainant's mark in its logo form.

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 the Complainant's 100GREEN mark adding only the geographical term "uk", a hyphen and the gTLD .com which do not prevent said confusing similarity.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not authorised by the Complainant.

The disputed domain name has been used for a fraudulent email scheme, including fraudulent invoices using the Complainant's mark in its logo form calculated to deceive and impersonate the Complainant. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name carries a high risk of affiliation with the Complainant and has been registered and used in bad faith for a fraudulent email scheme, impersonating the Complainant to cause confusion for commercial gain and disrupt the Complainant's business.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here "uk" 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. Nor does the addition of a hyphen.

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.

The Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has been used for a fraudulent email scheme including fraudulent invoices using the Complainant's mark in its logo form which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here passing off for fraudulent purposes 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 used the disputed domain name for a fraudulent email scheme, including fraudulent invoices using the Complainant's mark in its logo form, thereby passing off, and disrupting the Complainant's business.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed passing off for fraudulent purposes 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 <100green-uk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dawn Osborne/
Dawn Osborne
Sole Panelist
Date: November 4, 2026