

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

G4S Limited v. Shubhan Sharma, individual
Case No. D2024-1224

1. The Parties

The Complainant is G4S Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Shubhan Sharma, individual, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <globalg4s.com> 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 March 21, 2024. On March 21, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 21, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 25, 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 25, 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 28, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 17, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 26, 2024.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on April 29, 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 provides security and facility services, among other services. It owns the mark G4S and enjoys the benefits of registration of that mark in a number of jurisdictions around the world (e.g., United States of America Reg. No. 3378800, registered on February 5, 2008). According to the Whois information, the disputed domain name was registered on December 2, 2023. The Complainant's evidence shows that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a Registrar-provided parked web page and that the Respondent previously used the disputed domain name to display pay-per-click (PPC) advertisement links that redirected users to third-party websites that offer services competitive to the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply 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

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. 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. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the G4S mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations.

The disputed domain name incorporates the G4S mark in its entirety with the term "global", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's G4S mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. The G4S mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) it has not authorized the Respondent to use the G4S mark in the disputed domain name, (2) the Respondent has not been known by the disputed domain name, and (3) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for unauthorized commercial purposes by displaying PPC advertisements, including links to competitors of the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this prima facie showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent's favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Policy describes several non-exhaustive circumstances demonstrating a respondent's bad faith registration and use. Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, a panel may find bad faith when a respondent uses the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or a product or service on the respondent's website or location.

Because the G4S mark is well known and because it is subject to registrations in countries around the world, the Panel finds it likely that the Respondent was aware of it when it registered the disputed domain name, and indeed targeted the Complainant and its mark when it registered the disputed domain name. In the circumstances of this case, the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. *Government Employees Insurance Company v. Joel Rosenzweig, RegC*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1221](#). Bad faith use is shown from the Respondent's activities of using the disputed domain name to present PPC links for commercial gain.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully met this third element.

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 <globalg4s.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: May 13, 2024