



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	27350-UDRP	Decision date: July 28, 2026
Disputed Domain Name:	<gardaworldcash.net>	
Registrar:	GoDaddy.com, LLC	
Panel:	María Alejandra López García	
Complainant:	Garda World Security Corporation	
Complainant's Representative:	Langlois Avocats, S.E.N.C.R.L.	
Respondent:	Rashad Page	

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Complainant was filed electronically with the CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE ("CIIDRC") on June 18, 2026.

On June 18, 2026, CIIDRC transmitted a request by email to the Registrar for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted to CIIDRC, by email, its verification response advising of the identity of the Respondent and providing the contact details for the disputed domain name. On June 18, 2026, CIIDRC sent an email communication to the Complainant 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 June 22, 2026.

CIIDRC verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy") adopted by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") on August 26, 1999 and approved by ICANN on October 24, 1999, the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP Rules") approved by ICANN on September 28, 2013, and in effect

Disputed Domain Name: <gardaworldcash.net>
27350-UDRP

as of July 31, 2015, and the CIIDRC Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”) in effect as of May 9, 2018.

Following the UDRP Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, CIIDRC formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 22, 2026. The proceedings commenced on April 1, 2025. Following the UDRP Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was July 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, CIIDRC notified the Respondent’s default on July 15, 2026.

On July 16, 2026, according to the Complainant's request to have the dispute decided by a single-member Panel, CIIDRC appointed María Alejandra López García as a Panelist. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by CIIDRC to ensure compliance with the UDRP Rules, paragraph 7.

Having reviewed CIIDRC's records, the Panel finds that CIIDRC has discharged its responsibility under paragraph 2(a) of the UDRP Rules. Therefore, the Panel may issue its decision based on the documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the UDRP Rules, the CIIDRC Supplemental Rules, and any applicable rules and principles of law that the Panel deems relevant, including the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“WIPO Overview 3.1”).

2. FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES

The Complainant is a security services provider company, headquartered in Montreal, Canada, with a worldwide presence. The Complainant operates more than 525 locations across 49 countries, employs over 132,000 people globally, serves more than 27,000 clients, and operates a fleet of over 6,500 vehicles and 103 cargo aircraft.

The Complainant offers global and national physical security, cash logistics, crisis management services, high-tech surveillance, and the installation, monitoring, and maintenance of home and business security systems.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following trademark registrations:

- Canadian Trademark for GARDA (word mark), Reg. No. TMA229778, registered on August 18, 1978, in force until August 18, 2033, and in International Class (“IC”) 45.
- Canadian Trademark for GARDAWORLD (word mark), Reg. No. TMA1259095, registered on September 30, 2020, in force until September 30, 2034, and in ICs 35 and 45.
- International Trademark for GARDA (word mark), Reg. No. 1705368, registered on September 22, 2022, in force until September 22, 2032, and in IC 45.

Furthermore, the Complainant also owns the domain names <garda.com>, <gardaworld.com>, and <cash.garda.com> from which it operates its official websites, prominently features its trademarks, and provides information to customers regarding its security products and services. These websites function as a central platform for sales, service requests, and customer engagement.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 6, 2026, and, as of the date of this Decision, resolves to an active website that purports to represent a business called “GARDAWORLD CASH”. The Panel notes that the website does not contain addresses, telephone numbers, or any other notable information besides a contact form requesting user details such as names, email addresses, and messages.

3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

- **Complainant**

In relation to the first element of the Policy, in summary, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks GARDA and GARDAWORLD.

In relation to the second element of the Policy, in summary, the Complainant contends that the Respondent doesn’t have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, given that the Complainant has not authorized, or granted any license, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use any of its trademarks, including as a domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is attempting to pass itself off as the Complainant, given that the website contains several elements that seem deliberately crafted to mirror the Complainant’s corporate identity through the name “GARDAWORLD CASH” and the slogan “Secure Cash Solutions Delivered Safely”; that the “GARDAWORLD CASH” logo features capitalized and bolded letter font which is similar to the style used by the Complainant, including prominently features imagery depicting a uniformed security or cash services employee assisting a customer with a transaction, reinforcing the idea that the website itself is associated with the Complainant’s services cash management services.

In relation to the third element of the Policy, in summary, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, given that: its composition, designed and registered to mislead Internet users into believing that the fraudulent site was associated with the Complainant; that the use given by the Respondent to promote a company, “GardaWorld Cash,” that does not exist in public corporate records to replicate and imitate the Complainant’s identity and legitimate business presence, which also seeks to collect data via the “Contact Us” form increases the risk of phishing or fraudulent data collection, scenario which also falls into paragraph 4(iv) of the Policy.

- **Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

- **Remedy Sought**

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

4. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

4.1 Requirements

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

In accordance with paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the absence of a Response, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint. The complainant bears the burden of proof; a respondent's default does not, by itself, mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.3. Therefore, the Panel will decide this case based on the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of evidence" standard. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.2.

Analysis

4.2.1 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, in this case, between the trademarks GARDA and GARDAWORLD and <gardaworldcash.net>. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Panel notes that the Complainant intended to include a comparison between its own domain names and website content and the disputed domain name as part of its arguments. However, this approach is not relevant to establishing cybersquatting under the Policy¹. Therefore, based on the records and the facts, the Panel determines the evidence of this case, in accordance with paragraph (10)(d) of the UDRP Rules.

¹ "The Final Report recommends that the scope of the administrative procedure be limited to cases of bad faith, abusive registration of domain names that violate trademark rights ("cybersquatting," in popular terminology)." See <https://www.wipo.int/amc/en/processes/process1/report/summary.html>

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of another term (here, “cash”) 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. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

In relation to the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) “.net”, it is well established that such element may typically be disregarded when it is used as a technical requirement of a domain name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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

4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating any of the circumstances, but without limitation, described in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

As previous panelists have established, satisfying the burden of proving a lack of the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy “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”. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the provided evidence, the Panel finds that nothing in the records suggests any of the circumstances set out under paragraph 4.(c) of the Policy. However, in particular, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant, which cannot constitute fair use. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

Additionally, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Therefore, to the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant has made out its *prima facie* case. In this case, in the absence of a Response, this Panel accepts the Complainant's undisputed factual assertions and submitted evidence as true.

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

4.2.3 Registration and Use in Bad Faith

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. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In this case, given the evidence, the nature and use of the disputed domain name, to this Panel, it is evident that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's business activity and the value of its trademarks GARDA and GARDAWORLD by the time of registration. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

Concerning the use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent has incurred in paragraph 4.(b)(iv) of the Policy. Additionally, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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

5. DECISION and ORDER

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy, 15 of the UDRP Rules, and Rule 10 of the Supplemental Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <gardaworldcash.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

Made as of **July 28, 2026**.

SIGNATURE OF PANEL

/María Alejandra López García/

María Alejandra López García

