

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cision US Inc. v. VECA POP, CISION

Case No. D2024-1086

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cision US Inc., United States of America (United States), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is VECA POP, CISION, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cisioncareers.com> is registered with Realtime Register B.V. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 12, 2024. On March 12, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 13, 2024, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 13, 2024, 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 March 14, 2024.

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").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 19, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 8, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 11, 2024.

The Center appointed Nicolas Ulmer as the sole panelist in this matter on April 18, 2024. 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 and its owned subsidiaries are companies involved in providing various public relations services, both in the United States and internationally. According to the Complaint and its Annexes the Complainant has or has had more than 100,00 clients, including a number of large and well-known corporations, and has close to 4,000 employees. The Complainant is publicly listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

The Complainant, primarily through its subsidiaries, owns the following trademark registrations for "CISION":

- USPTO reg. 3550372, date December 23, 2008, class 35
- WIPO reg. 932500, date March 2, 2007, classes 35, 38
- CIPO reg. TMA730363, date December 8, 2008, classes 35,36, 38, 41, 42
- EUIPO reg. 005712278, date June 4, 2010, classes 35, 36, 38, 41, 42

The Complainant has a significant presence on the Internet, with numerous domain names that incorporate its CISION trademark; the Complainant hosts its primary website at <cision.com>.

Little is known about the Respondent, who initially registered the disputed domain name with a privacy service cover.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 28, 2024, and resolves to an the Registrar parking website. The Complainant provided evidence on record that the disputed domain name has been used for fraudulent job scam emails.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under paragraph 4(a) the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it has greatly invested in promoting its well-known trademark and in building its reputation in the global marketplace. The Complainant then asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark, and that the addition of the suffix "careers" does not diminish or negate that similarity; is not a name in which the Respondent has been given, or otherwise has, any rights or legitimate interest; and that the disputed domain name can only have been registered, and is and has been used, in bad faith by the Respondent, including for the launching of a "phishing attack". The Complainant further asserts that the current inactive status of the disputed domain name does not here prevent a finding of bad faith use.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain name begins with and recites the entirety of the Complainant's trademark. The addition of the suffix "careers" does not render the Complainant's trademark unrecognisable or otherwise

prevent a finding of confusing similarity, and this suffix may be indicia of bad faith as discussed in connection with the third element below. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is here found to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant makes clear that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way and that it has no knowledge or good faith belief that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

It is furthermore obvious that the Respondent is not known by the name "Cisioncareers".

A review of the file in this matter reveals no indication that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or that there is any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Complainant's trademark, and the Complainant denies that this could be the case.

It is long-accepted in UDRP case law and jurisprudence that a complainant needs to demonstrate at least a prima facie case that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name see *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#). Where such a prima facie case is made, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy see also, *Meizu Technology Co., Ltd. v. "osama bin laden"*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2014-0002](#); *H & M Hennes & Mauritz AB v. Simon Maufe, Akinsaya Odunayo Emmanuel and Nelson Rivaldo*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0225](#).

In the instant case the Respondent has not answered the Complaint and the Complainant has established at least such a prima facie case; the Complainant has therefore met its burden of proof under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing via a fraudulent email scheme, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel accordingly finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The facts briefly adumbrated above are strongly suggestive of bad faith, and the further facts and indicia below confirm such a finding.

First, the Complainant has established that its trademark is well known and has a significant Internet and marketplace presence. Furthermore, and as pointed out by the Complainant, the trademarked word "cision" is not of common parlance (at least in English) but does have a strong association with the Complainant and its heavily-promoted business. Finally, the addition of the suffix "careers" not only does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, but is a strong indicia that the Respondent is familiar with the Complainant's business and that the Respondent seeks to advance a confusingly similar domain name that suggests an association with the Complainant. It is therefore highly implausible that the Respondent found and registered the disputed domain name serendipitously and highly likely that it was registered for bad faith purposes. Conversely, it is here difficult to see to what good faith purpose the disputed domain name could have been intended—and the defaulting Respondent has not asserted one.

The Panel is comforted in this view by unrebutted evidence submitted that the disputed domain name has in fact been used in connection with at least one phishing exercise. Specifically, the Complainant alleges and submits evidence to the effect that the Respondent created email accounts, including the account

"[...]@cisioncareers.com", based on the disputed domain name which were then used to send messages to potential job applicants suggesting that they were chosen for remote employment by the Complainant, and this in an apparent effort to obtain sensitive personal and financial information by pretending to be affiliated with the Complainant. Such illegal activity can only be considered as comports bad faith registration and use within the meaning of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.4.

The Panel thus 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 <cisioncareers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicolas Ulmer/

Nicolas Ulmer

Sole Panelist

Date: April 23, 2024