

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-103840

Case number CAC-UDRP-103840

Time of filing 2021-06-07 09:19:31

Domain names HIDGOLBAL.COM

Case administrator

Organization Denisa Bilík (CAC) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization ASSA ABLOY AB

Complainant representative

Organization Coöperatieve Vereniging SNB-REACT U.A.

Respondent

Name Linda Bonds

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is - among others - the owner of the EU trademarks nos. 001061464 "HID" (since 2000) and 005352951 "HID GLOBAL" (since 2007), as well as of US trademarks no. 85756909 "HID" and no. 78853856 "HID GLOBAL".

The Complainant also owns several domain names incorporating the wording "HID GLOBAL", such as <hidglobal.com>, <hidglobal.co.uk>, <hidglobal.de> and <hidglobal.se>.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant is a well-known global leader in door opening solutions, present in more than 70 countries and with a leading market position in Europe, North America and the Asia Pacific region.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations consisting of the wording "HID" and "HID GLOBAL". Likewise, the Complainant is also the owner of a portfolio of domain names including the wordings "HID GLOBAL" since

many years.

The Respondent has registered the domain name <hidgolbal.com> only on December 16, 2020.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name would be a misspelled variation of the Complainant's registered trademark "HID GLOBAL".

The Complainant affirms that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and is not related in any way with the Complainant's business. In particular, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not affiliated with the ASSA ABLOY group, nor authorized by the latter in any way. In addition, The Complainant affirms it currently does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used for phishing purposes.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IS IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TO THE COMPLAINANT'S TRADEMARK

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks "HID GLOBAL", "HID" and to the relative domain names registered by the Complainant, which has proven to have earlier rights.

In particular, the Panel agrees that the mere inversion of letters "L" and "O" is not sufficient at all to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark "HID GLOBAL". On the contrary, the obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark "HID GOLBAL" instead of "HID GLOBAL" is a clear evidence of "typosquatting".

Many WIPO and CAC decisions – also involving the present Complainant – confirmed that the slight spelling variations do not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trademark. They do not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant, its trademark and domain names associated.

There is no doubt that the same case lies before us in this matter.

THE RESPONDENT HAS NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

According to the information provided by the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. Likewise, the Complainant neither licensed nor authorized the Respondent to make any use of its trademarks "HID GLOBAL" and "HID", or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name on behalf of the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

It is undeniable that Complainant is only required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Once such prima facie case is made, Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy.

Given all the above and taken into account the fact that the Respondent did not provide any response within the present proceeding, the Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant that the Respondent has no such rights or legitimate interests in <hidgolbal.com>.

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME HAS BEEN REGISTERED AND IS BEING USED IN BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the Complainant successfully submitted prima facie evidence that the Respondent has made no use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, neither of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. This prima facie evidence was not challenged by the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was used for sending email messages to third parties with the Complainant's mark in the footer, which is a clear attempt to impersonate ASSA ABLOY AB.

As indicated by both consistent case-law and the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, panelists have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (including phishing) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

In the absence of a response from Linda Bonds and given (i) the reputation of the Complainant and its trademarks and (ii) the phishing cases already faced by ASSA ABLOY AB similar to the present one, the Panel infers that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademarks "HID GLOBAL" in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

Consequently, the Panel believes that the same was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **HIDGOLBAL.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Tommaso La Scala
------	------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2021-07-12

Publish the Decision