

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

GlobalLogic Inc. v. jeyu map, global  
Case No. D2024-1867

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is GlobalLogic Inc., United States of America, represented by Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP, United States of America.

Respondent is jeyu map, global, United States of America.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <globallogiccareer.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 2, 2024. On May 3, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 6, 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 7, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on May 15, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 May 16, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 5, 2024. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on June 6, 2024.

The Center appointed Timothy D. Casey as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 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

Complainant is a digital product engineering company based in California, United States of America, that designs, develops, installs, tests and maintains software for others.

Complainant has a registration for a trademark for GLOBALLOGIC (the "GLOBALLOGIC Mark") as follows:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Class(es)	Registration No.	Registration Date
GLOBALLOGIC	United States of America	42	4,287,701	February 12, 2013

Complainant is also the owner of the domain <globallogic.com>, which has been registered since March 30, 2000. The disputed domain name was registered on March 23, 2024, and at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to any website. Complainant provided evidence indicating that the disputed domain name was utilized in emails impersonating an employee of Complainant related to employment recruiting.

#### 5. Parties' Contentions

##### A. Complainant

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

Notably, Complainant contends that it has rights in the GLOBALLOGIC Mark, as evidenced herein, which is has used at least since 2006, and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the GLOBALLOGIC Mark because the disputed domain name incorporates the GLOBALLOGIC Mark in its entirety and the addition of the descriptive term "career", which borrows the letter "c" from the last letter in "globallogic", and a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") in the disputed domain name do nothing to reduce the confusing similarity. Complainant contends that the difference between the disputed domain name and the GLOBALLOGIC Mark only serve to mislead and deceive consumers by suggesting a connection to or affiliation with Complainant.

Complainant contends that Respondent has no legitimate interest in the disputed domain name because Respondent has no rights to the disputed domain name of which Complainant is aware and Complainant has not given any permission to Respondent to use the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name was in bad faith as it was done so for the purpose of intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the GLOBALLOGIC Mark. Such bad faith, along with bad faith utilization, is evidenced by Respondent's registration of a domain name that will mislead consumers and cause confusion as to the identify of Respondent. Respondent has also used an email address associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate an individual associated with Complainant's business in an attempt to obtain confidential personal information from others associated with employment applications in an attempt to defraud victims of the scheme. Complainant has attempted to deliver a cease-and-desist letter to the email address used by Respondent and received no response. Complainant has also notified Respondent's activities to the Federal Bureau of Investigations and the Federal Trade Commission in the United States of America.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

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

Although the addition of other terms here, "career", which borrows the letter "c" from "globallogic", 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.

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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although 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 difficult 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). 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 available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation of a hiring person affiliated with Complainant, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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, the Panel notes that Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after Complainant established rights in the GLOBALLOGIC Mark and the “intentionally attempted to attract, presumably for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark”.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation of a hiring person affiliated with Complainant, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <globallogicareer.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Timothy D. Casey/*

**Timothy D. Casey**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 26, 2024