ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
JAS WORLDWIDE MANAGEMENT, INC. v. Gevorg Nersisyan
Case No. D2026-4484

1. The Parties

The Complainant is JAS WORLDWIDE MANAGEMENT, INC., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Bates & Bates LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Gevorg Nersisyan, Armenia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <quote-jasforwardinginc.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 October 2, 2026. On October 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 7, 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 the Complainant on October 8, 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 8, 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 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Martin Michaus Romero as the sole panelist in this matter on November 6, 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

Based on the Complaint, the Complainant is a global logistics company with over 40 years of experience providing worldwide supply chain services, including freight transportation, brokerage, storage, and forwarding services in numerous industries, including but not limited to, aerospace, automotive, chemical, e-commerce, energy solutions, engineering and manufacturing, food and beverage, healthcare, retail and consumer products, and technology, and is the owner of the JAS mark.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for the trademark JAS, in different jurisdictions, notably in International Classes 35, 36, 39, and 42, such as:

- Brazilian Registration Number 816536112 for JAS registered on September 8, 1993;
- French Registration Number 1641514 for JAS registered on January 31, 1991; and
- United States Registration Number 6148084 for JAS (stylized) registered on September 8, 2020.

The Complainant owns several domain names comprising the JAS mark, including but not limited to the domain name <jas.com>, created on October 27, 1994.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 25, 2026, and although not resolving to an active website, according to the Complaint evidence, it has been used to send emails to third-party freight carriers, using the name “JAS Forwarders USA” and the Complainant’s mark, address, and official domain name, and asking for a price quote for a shipment.

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 wholly incorporates and is confusingly similar to its registered and distinctive JAS mark.

- The Complainant has not given the Respondent any right to use the JAS name or mark, nor has it licensed the Respondent to use its trademark in the disputed domain name.

- The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not registered and used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, or for any legitimate noncommercial fair use.

- The Respondent registered the confusingly similar disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant to tender freight via scam emails.

- Prior to the Complaint filing, the Complainant has submitted several reports of abuse to the Registrar of record who also appears to be the web host of record, requesting suspension of the disputed domain name

for the Respondent's fraudulent activity. Despite these reports of abuse, the Respondent has continued its scam email scheme.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probability that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 trademark JAS is reproduced in its entirety 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.

The addition of the term "quote" and a hyphen before the trademark JAS , followed by the phrase "forwarding" and the term "inc", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.8 and 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 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 has neither used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services nor for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's JAS trademark and terms associated with its business cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant also considering that the disputed domain name has been used to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant. As such, in the Panel's view, the disputed domain name was used with the intention to mislead Internet users into believing that there is a connection or association with the Complainant. Further, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to it.

UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed impersonation, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.

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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the Panel notes that:

- The Respondent more likely than not knew or should have been aware of the existence of the Complainant, its activities and business operations under the JAS trademark, at the time of registering the disputed domain name, noting the nature and use of the disputed domain name.

- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's JAS trademark, combining the mark with terms directly related to the Complainant's business, inferring the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant during the registration of the disputed domain name.

- The Complainant's JAS trademark and domain names predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

- The Complainant has not granted authorization, consent, or license to the Respondent to use the JAS mark, as part of the disputed domain name.

- The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant by reproducing the Complainant's JAS trademark, address, and official domain name without authorization in fraudulent emails sent to third parties.

- The Respondent did not file any response.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed impersonation, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith.

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 <quote-jasforwardinginc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Martin Michaus Romero/
Martin Michaus Romero
Sole Panelist
Date: November 11, 2026