

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Orkin Expansion, Inc. v. khaled alshayeb
Case No. D2023-2910

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Orkin Expansion, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Arnall Golden Gregory LLP, United States.

The Respondent is khaled alshayeb, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <orkinuae.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 6, 2023. On July 7, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 12, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 1, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. The Respondent sent several email communications to the Center on July 12 and July 18, 2023. The Center sent an email regarding possible settlement on July 18, 2023. However, the Complainant did not request for suspension. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on August 2, 2023.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 2023. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), “to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent”. Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a formal response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Orkin Expansion, Inc., a United States company operating in the field of pest control services, and owning several trademark registrations worldwide for ORKIN, among which:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 568,404 for ORKIN, registered on December 23, 1952;
- United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration No. 90344 for ORKIN and design, registered on February 11, 2007.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its website in the United Arab Emirates, namely the Respondent’s country, being “www.orkinuae.ae”.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was registered on March 29, 2023, and it redirects Internet users to the website “www.landscapingdubai.ae”, in which landscaping services in Dubai, United Arab Emirates are provided.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark ORKIN.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a *bona fide* offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is used to divert customers away from the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant’s trademark ORKIN is well-known in the field of pest control services. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain,

Internet users to the Respondent's website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no formal reply to the Complainant's contentions. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the absence of a reply to the Complainant's contentions have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

However, on July 12 and 18, 2023, the Center received the following informal email communications from the Respondent:

"sorry, i don't understand what is the issue. [...] this is my number in dubai." (July 12, 2023);

"Hello, if they want to buy the domain, it is for sale at a price of \$30,000. Thank you" (July 18, 2023).

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (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 respect of 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here "uae", 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 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain, in this case ".com", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the 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.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark ORKIN in the field of pest control services is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent must have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith since the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the disputed domain name’s source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant’s business.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant’s business, and to attract Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which includes the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of a geographic term, further supports a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Finally, the fact that the Respondent offered to sell the disputed domain name for USD 30,000 (indicated with “\$” in Respondent’s email communication, presumably USD), an amount of money that likely exceeds the out-of-pocket cost of its registration, reinforces the Panel’s opinion about the Respondent’s registration and use of that disputed domain name in bad faith.

Based on the available record, 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 <orkinuae.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2023