

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Stripe, Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2024-3490

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Stripe, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Elster & McGrady LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <s1ripe.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 27, 2024. On August 28, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 28, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name that differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 29, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to amend the Complaint. The Complainant filed an Amended Complaint on September 3, 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”).

¹ Considering the alleged impersonation in the registration details of the Domain Name, the Panel has redacted the Registrant’s name from this Decision. The Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Domain Name that includes the name of the Registrant disclosed by the Registrar, and has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding. The Panel has further directed the Center, pursuant to paragraph 4(j) of the Policy and paragraph 16(b) of the Rules, that Annex 1 to this Decision not be published due to exceptional circumstances. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 11, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 1, 2024. The Respondent did not submit a response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 2, 2024.

The Center appointed A. Justin Ourso III as the panelist in this matter on October 7, 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 is an American corporation that builds infrastructure for Internet financial transactions for its clients in over forty countries, which has operated under the well-known mark STRIPE since 2011.

The Complainant owns a Canada registration, No. TMA843977, for its STRIPE trademark, issued on February 20, 2013, for financial services of various kinds in Class 36, and a United States registration, No. 4,451,679, for its STRIPE trademark, issued on December 17, 2013, for financial services of various kinds in Class 36.

The Complainant operates a web site at "www.stripe.com," where it publishes its documentation, libraries, API resources, and other content.

The unidentified Respondent registered the Domain Name on March 18, 2024, without any authorization from the Complainant, falsely using the name of an officer of the Complainant for the Registrant's name. The Respondent is passively holding the Domain Name, but has used it in emails to employees of the Complainant. During the preparation of this decision, attempts to access the web site did not resolve to a web page.

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 the Respondent has engaged in typosquatting and has sent impersonating emails targeting the Complainant's employees in a fraudulent attempt to obtain customer account information, but subsequently removed the mail exchange records associated with the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a response to the Amended Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

A complainant must prove three elements to obtain relief: (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights; (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and (iii) the respondent registered and is using the domain name in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

On the first element, the Panel finds that the Complainant's registrations establish its trademark rights. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1. The Domain Name substitutes the number "1" for the letter "t" in the Complainant's mark STRIPE. A domain name that consists of an intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered to be confusingly similar to the subject mark for the purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. When the Domain Name is looked at quickly and not closely, as when it appears as part of an email address, it is confusingly similar to the trademark. The Panel finds that the trademark is sufficiently recognizable within the Domain Name for the Domain Name to be confusingly similar to the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the first element: the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has not claimed the existence of any circumstance under the Policy, paragraph 4(c), that demonstrates that a respondent has rights to, or legitimate interests in, a domain name. The Complainant, on the other hand, has shown that it established its trademark rights before the Respondent registered the Domain Name; it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark; the record contains no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name; and the Respondent is passively holding the Domain Name, which does not resolve to a functioning site, and which is not a bona fide commercial use, a noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Name. These constitute prima facie a showing that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii), shifting the burden of production on this second element to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence proving rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1. The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to rebut the prima facie showing.

Additionally, the Panel finds that the Respondent provided false domain name registration contact details, identifying itself using the name of an officer of the Complainant, which does not resemble the Domain Name, and provided an email address for the Respondent that does not resemble the Domain Name, which corroborate that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name; and the Respondent failed to provide any evidence of an actual or a planned bona fide commercial use, a noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Name, or even to respond to the Complaint. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.13.2 and 2.5.3.

More importantly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has impersonated a Complainant officer in an email using the Domain Name that targeted employees of the Complainant in a surreptitious attempt to obtain information about a customer account of the Complainant. Panels have held categorically that the use of a domain name for impersonation to perpetrate a fraud cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the second element: the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Respondent's impersonation of the Complainant's officer is conclusive evidence that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark, and of its rights in its mark, at the time that the Respondent registered the Domain Name, and that the Respondent targeted the Complainant. This impersonation in a surreptitious attempt to obtain information on a customer account of the Complainant is *per se* illegitimate activity and a bad faith use of the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.4. These findings compel the Panel's conclusion that the Respondent (1) intentionally registered the Domain Name in bad faith with fraudulent intent and (2) used it in bad faith with fraudulent intent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1, 3.1.4, and 3.4. The findings that the Respondent engaged in typosquatting, provided false contact information, and failed to submit a response to the Complaint support the conclusion of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.6. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the

Complainant has proven the third element: the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

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 Domain Name <s1ripe.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/A. Justin Ourso III/

A. Justin Ourso III

Panelist

Date: October 14, 2024