



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	26951-UDRP	Decision date: June 5, 2026
Domain Name:	<traffictech.co>	
Panel:	Douglas M. Isenberg	
Complainant:	Traffic Tech Inc.	
Respondent:	Hard Rock / exxonmobil.com	

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The procedural history of this case was set out in a letter from the Canadian International Internet Dispute Resolution Centre to the Panel:

1. On March 26, 2026, the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the UDRP and the UDRP Rules via online platform.
2. On March 26, 2026, CIIDRC transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name, and the Registrar responded advising of the identity of the Respondent and providing the above contact details. In addition, the Registrar confirmed that the disputed domain name was placed in a Registrar LOCK.
3. On April 21, 2026, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the dispute resolution process.
4. On April 21, 2026, pursuant to UDRP Rule 4 and Supplemental Rule 5, CIIDRC notified the Respondent of this administrative proceeding and forwarded a Notice of Complaint to the Respondent.
5. The deadline for submitting a Response was set for May 11, 2026.
6. The Respondent has failed to file its response.

7. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single member. The required Panel fee deposit was received on June 3, 2026.

In accordance with Rule 5 (d), CIIDRC appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as a single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter on June 4, 2026. The undersigned completed and returned to CIIDRC the statement of acceptance and declaration of impartiality and independence on the same date.

This matter is conducted pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Policy) and the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Rules) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

2. FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES

Complainant states that it is “a transportation logistics company which is multifaceted”; that it was “renamed to Traffic Tech Inc.” in 1988; and that “[i]n 2015, the 25th branch office opened and we expanded to 5 countries, and 2 million shipments were delivered.” Complainant states that it is the registrant of the domain name <traffictech.com>, which was created on June 8, 1997.

Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that it owns trademark registrations for “Traffic Tech” in Canada, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Argentina, Mexico, the European Union, Switzerland, Turkey and Belarus. These registrations include the following:

- Canada Reg. No. TMA1140789 for TRAFFIC TECH (registered September 1, 2022) for use in connection with, inter alia, “freight brokerage services”
- U.S. Reg. No. 3,409,061 for TRAFFIC TECH (registered April 8, 2008) for use in connection with, inter alia, “freight brokerage”
- UK Reg. No. UK00003674972 for TRAFFIC TECH (registered November 19, 2021) for use in connection with, inter alia, “freight and transport brokerage”

These registrations are referred to herein as the “TRAFFIC TECH Trademark.”

The Domain Name was registered on March 12, 2026. Complainant states that “the Respondent has leveraged the fraudulent domain name to impersonate our personnel, including our sales agents, in order to communicate with our partners and customers about certain loads.” In support thereof, Complainant provided an email sent from an address using the Domain Name, apparently addressed to a customer of Complainant, providing details for an international wire transfer.

3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

The Complainant submits the following:

- The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the TRAFFIC TECH Trademark.
- Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, there is no website associated with the Domain Name, which “[s]hows that Respondent has not been using domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, since it is clearly for fraudulent actions”; Respondent has used “a secret identity attempting to acting fraudulently in intercepting emails”; and the Domain Name is “is clearly [being used] for fraudulent reasons.”
- The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith because, inter alia, “by using said domain name, Respondent intentionally attempted to fraudulently redirect payments from Traffic Tech’s customers to itself, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s domain name”; and “Respondent is impersonating actual Traffic Tech employees by using their real names, and nearly identical email addresses.”

- **Respondent**

The Respondent did not participate in this proceeding.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests the Domain Name be transferred to it.

4. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

4.1 Requirements

In accordance with Paragraph 4 of the Policy, the onus is on the Complainant to prove that:

1. the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
3. the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn.

4.2 Analysis

4.2.1 The Domain Name is Identical or Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant has Rights

Based upon the trademark registrations cited by the Complainant, it is apparent that the Complainant has rights in and to the TRAFFIC TECH Trademark.

As to whether the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the TRAFFIC TECH Trademark, the relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Domain Name only (i.e., “traffictech”) because “[t]he applicable Top-Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name (e.g., ‘.com’, ‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test”. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“WIPO Overview 3.1”), section 1.11.1.

As set forth in section 1.7 of WIPO Overview 3.1, “in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark..., the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark.” Here, the Domain Name contains the entirety of the TRAFFIC TECH Trademark. Of course, the fact that the Domain Name does not contain a space between the words “TRAFFIC” and “TECH” is irrelevant for purposes of the Policy because “the addition or substitution of spaces... is... inconsequential in determining identity or confusing similarity” and spaces “cannot be reproduced in a domain name” and therefore are irrelevant. *Société Air France v. Indra Armansyah*, WIPO Case No. D2016-2027.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name

The Complainant has argued that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name because, *inter alia*, “there is no website associated with the Domain Name, which “[s]hows that Respondent has not been using domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, since it is clearly for fraudulent actions”; Respondent has used “a secret identity attempting to acting fraudulently in intercepting emails”; and the Domain Name is “is clearly [being used] for fraudulent reasons.”

WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1, states: “Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has established its *prima facie* case and without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

4.2.3 Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the Policy may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in the Policy: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the registrant’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant’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 registrant’s website or location or of a product or service on the registrant’s website or location. Policy, paragraph 4(b).

By using the Domain Name in connection with a business email compromise scam – a type of phishing activity – Respondent has clearly acted bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Indeed, as set forth in section 3.4 of WIPO Overview 3.1, use of a disputed domain name in connection with “scams such as sending email, phishing, [or] identity theft,” including “to solicit payment of fraudulent invoices by the complainant’s actual or prospective customers,” constitutes bad faith. See also, e.g., *Syngenta Participations AG v. Guillaume Texier, Gobain Ltd*, WIPO Case No. D2017-1147 (finding bad faith where “the disputed domain name was used... as an email address to send a request to an employee of the Complainant requesting urgent payment of monies claimed to be due on a false invoice”); *Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. v. Abraham Hashim*, WIPO Case No. DCO2019-0017 (finding bad faith where respondent “posed as two of Complainant’s actual employees in order to send phishing emails to one of Complainant’s clients in an effort to obtain payment on an allegedly outstanding invoice”); and *BTWN Exhibits, LLC v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Ahmed Fawzy, ASM Marketing*, WIPO Case No. D2020-0036 (finding bad faith where “Respondent used the Domain Name to create an email address [and] send fraudulent emails to Complainant’s customers”).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

5. DECISION and ORDER

For the above reasons, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the Policy, Paragraph 15 of the Rules, and Rule 10 of the Supplemental Rules, the Panel orders that the Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of June 5, 2026.

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

