

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vizient, Inc. v. lincash Vizigotus
Case No. D2024-4437

1. The Parties

Complainant is Vizient, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

Respondent is lincash Vizigotus, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vizient.equipment> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 29, 2024. On October 30, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 31, 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/lincash Vizigotus) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 31, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 1, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 1, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 21, 2024. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on November 22, 2024.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on November 27, 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 company based in the United States. Since 2015, Complainant has offered software and services to hospitals and healthcare facilities under the mark VIZIENT. In this regard, Complainant is the owner of several registrations for the VIZIENT mark. These include, among others, United States Registrations Nos. 5162375 and 5162376 (both registered March 14, 2017). Complainant also owns the registration for the domain name <vizientinc.com>, which Complainant uses to communicate with prospective clients online.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 26, 2024. The disputed domain is being redirected to Complainant's official website at "www.vizientinc.com". Respondent has further used the disputed domain name to set up an email address to impersonate an employee of Complainant, targeting potential clients of Complainant. Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, nor any license to use its marks.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the VIZIENT mark, which Complainant uses in its business interactions with its over 1,400 suppliers, resulting in 275 billion USD in annual purchased services. Complainant contends that Respondent has incorporated in full Complainant's VIZIENT mark into the disputed domain name, with only the addition of the generic top-level domain, ".equipment". Complainant further contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, having simply acquired the disputed domain name for Respondent's own commercial gain.

In particular, Complainant asserts that Respondent has set up an email address associated with the disputed domain name, which Respondent has used in an attempt to impersonate Complainant, sending phishing emails to potential clients of Complainant. In doing so, Respondent has utilized the name of an actual employee of Complainant in acts of identity fraud, while further confusing clients by redirecting the URL associated with the disputed domain name to Complainant's official website at "www.vizientinc.com".

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 the 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, VIZIENT, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The mark is wholly incorporated, without adornment, in the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is identical to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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.

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 the 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, including phishing activity as here, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent's lack of "rights or legitimate interests" in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4, above, the disputed domain is being redirected to Complainant's official website at "www.vizientinc.com". Respondent has further used the disputed domain name to set up an email address to impersonate an employee of Complainant, targeting potential clients of Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Therefore, the Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <vizient.equipment> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: December 5, 2024