ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
CallRevu, LLC v. Evan Reed
Case No. DCO2026-0056

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CallRevu, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Evan Reed[1], United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <calldrip.co> 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 July 20, 2026. On July 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 21, 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 July 23, 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 July 23, 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").

[1] For purposes of this Decision, the Panel refers to the Respondent as Evan Reed, the registrant name disclosed by the Registrar. The Panel notes that, in the Respondent's sole communication to the Center, sent from the email address disclosed by the Registrar, the sender identified himself as "Evan Savar" and provided the same telephone number disclosed by the Registrar for Evan Reed.

Before commencement of the proceedings, the Respondent sent a brief email communication to the Center on July 23, 2026, stating, "I'm Confused." In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a formal Response. The Commencement of Panel Appointment Process email was sent on September 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 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 provider of automotive communications technology and services. On April 21, 2026, the Complainant acquired CallDrip, a provider of automated lead engagement and workflow solutions. The Complainant is the owner of United States Trademark Registration No. 7,732,014 for the mark CALLDRIP, registered on March 18, 2025, for software-as-a-service used in connection with sales and marketing leads. The CALLDRIP registration was assigned to the Complainant in connection with its acquisition of CallDrip. The disputed domain name was registered on April 5, 2025. The Complainant asserts, without contradiction from the Respondent, that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website purporting to offer services and solutions identical or highly related to those offered by CallDrip.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's CALLDRIP trademark; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a substantive Response to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

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 the CALLDRIP trademark for purposes of the Policy by virtue of its United States trademark registration. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the CALLDRIP mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The country-code Top-Level Domain ".co" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the CALLDRIP mark for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.11.

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 a 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. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

The Complainant asserts that: (i) the Respondent has no prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; (ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the CALLDRIP mark; (iii) the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the CALLDRIP mark or to register the disputed domain name; and (iv) the Respondent is not a licensee of the CALLDRIP mark. The Panel finds that 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. Nothing else in the record otherwise tips the balance in the Respondent's favor. Moreover, the disputed domain name consists solely of the CALLDRIP mark - which, as combined, is a coined term – together with the ".co" country-code Top-Level Domain and the Panel therefore finds that such composition coupled with the unrebutted claim that the disputed domain name used to resolve to a website in which the Respondent attempted to impersonate the Complainant, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

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 forth circumstances that may constitute evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. These circumstances are not exhaustive.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. Several circumstances support this conclusion: (i) the disputed domain name consists solely of the CALLDRIP mark together with the ".co" country-code Top-Level Domain; (ii) the disputed domain name was registered shortly after the CALLDRIP mark was registered in the United States; (iii) the Panel has independently ascertained that, shortly after registration, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a "Launching Soon" website displaying a contact form and referencing the Complainant's CALLDRIP mark in the copyright

notice;[2] (iv) the Respondent has offered no explanation for his selection of the disputed domain name. Taken together, these circumstances show that it is more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of and targeted the CALLDRIP mark when he registered the disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name also establishes bad faith use. The Complainant asserts, without contradiction from the Respondent, that the Respondent used the disputed domain name, which consists entirely of the CALLDRIP mark, for a website purporting to offer identical or highly related services. On this undisputed record, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the CALLDRIP mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <calldrip.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/
Evan D. Brown
Sole Panelist
Date: September 25, 2026

[2] www.web.archive.org/web/20250408091855/https://calldrip.co/ (noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.8).