

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CenturyLink Communications, LLC v. Privacy Administrator, Anonymize, Inc.

Case No. D2022-1171

1. The Parties

Complainant is CenturyLink Communications, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Wiley Rein, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Privacy Administrator, Anonymize, Inc., United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cneturylink.com> is registered with Epik, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 4, 2022. On April 5, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 5, 2022, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing contact information.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 14, 2022. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 4, 2022. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on May 12, 2022.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on May 25, 2022. 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

Complainant is a global network communications company, based in the United States. Since at least 2009, Complainant has offered network communication and other products and services under its CENTURYLINK mark. Complainant is the owner of several registrations for these marks, including, among others, United States Registration No. 4002609 (registered on July 26, 2011).

The disputed domain name was registered on May 21, 2019. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an active website displaying Pay-Per-Click (“PPC”) links, although Respondent previously set up the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to other sites, while including specific reference to a correct spelling of “centurylink.com.” Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, nor any license to use its marks.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns marks for CENTURYLINK for various products and services, including network communications services.

Complainant further contends that its CENTURYLINK mark enjoys a “widespread reputation” such that there is a high likelihood of confusion from the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that Respondent has incorporated its well-known CENTURYLINK mark into the disputed domain name, with only a “mere misspelling” of the word “century,” wherein Respondent switched the second and third letters of the mark in a deliberate act of “typosquatting.” Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, having simply acquired the disputed domain name for Respondent’s own commercial gain, likely in order to confuse consumers seeking the network communications services offered under Complainant’s CENTURYLINK mark. In this regard, Complainant contends that Respondent has set up the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to other websites that may contain malware, and that Respondent may further be using the disputed domain name in a “phishing” scheme.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel must first determine whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The Panel finds that it is. The disputed domain name directly incorporates Complainant’s CENTURYLINK mark, but with a clear and obvious misspelling of the word “century.”

This indicates a practice commonly known as “typosquatting,” where a domain name registrant deliberately registers common misspellings of a well-known mark in order to divert consumer traffic. Other UDRP panels have routinely found typosquatted domain names like these to be “confusingly

similar” for purposes of a finding under the UDRP. See *Edmonds.com, Inc. v. Yingkun Guo, dba This domain name is 4 sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0694](#); *Disney Enterprises, Inc. v. John Zuccarini, Cupcake City and Cupcake Patrol*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0489](#); See also *Credit Karma, Inc. v. Domain Admin, Whols Privacy Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0194](#).

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel next considers whether Complainant has shown that Respondent has no “rights or legitimate interests,” as must be proven to succeed in a UDRP dispute. Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy gives examples that might show rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. These examples include: (i) use of the domain name “in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services”; (ii) demonstration that respondent has been “commonly known by the domain name”; or (iii) “legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue”.

No evidence has been presented to the Panel that might support a claim of Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and Respondent has no license from, or other affiliation with, Complainant.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s decision, Respondent has set up the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to other sites. Complainant has also submitted credible evidence that Respondent may be using the disputed domain name in a phishing scheme to attract Internet users seeking Complainant’s services, presumably for Respondent’s own commercial gain. Among other things, the redirected website from the disputed domain name makes specific reference to “centurylink.com,” spelled correctly. The Panel finds that Complainant has demonstrated a likelihood that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name although aware of Complainant’s prior use of its mark for global communication and other services. See *Centurylink Intellectual Property, LLC v. Barry Deuschle*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2015-0030](#).

Therefore, the Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <centurylink.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: June 8, 2022