DISPUTE RESOLUTION SERVICE DECISION

CommScope North Carolina, LLC v. ABCD
Case No. DUK2026-0104

1. The Parties

1.1. The Complainant is CommScope, North Carolina, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Merchant & Gould P.C., United States.

1.2. The Respondent is ABCD, Viet Nam. (Collectively, the "Parties".)

2. The Domain Name and Registry

2.1 The Registry of the disputed domain name <comscope.co.uk> (the "Domain Name") is Nominet UK ("Nominet" or the "Registry").

3. Procedural History

3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on 11 September 2026. On 14 September 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registry verification in connection with the Domain Name. On 14 September 2026, the Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent ("Redacted for Privacy") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on 14 September 2026, inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on 14 September 2026.

3.2 The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Dispute Resolution Service (the "Policy" or "DRS Policy").

3.3 In accordance with the Policy, paragraphs 3 and 6, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint on 15 September 2026. In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 7, the due date for Response was 6 October 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties that no Response had been received on 7 October 2026 and advised the Complainant to pay the fee for an expert decision.

3.4 The Complainant paid the fee for an expert decision on 19 October 2026.

3.5 The Center appointed Dr Russell Richardson as the Expert in this matter on 27 October 2026. The Expert finds that it was properly constituted. The Expert has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Policy, paragraph 15.

4. Factual Background

4.1 The Complainant provides communications infrastructure solutions (the “Services”) and sells related products including antennas, cables, connectors, and networking systems (the “Products”).

4.2 The Complainant provides its Services and sells its Products through its website at the address “www.commscope.com”, the domain name for which it registered on 10 February 1994.

4.3 The Complainant holds various internationally registered trade marks for the name “COMMSCOPE” (the “Mark”), including United Kingdom trade mark number UK00900966937, registered on 29 February 2000, and international trade mark number 1512957, registered on 22 April 2020.

4.4 The Respondent registered the Domain Name on 4 September 2026. The Domain Name does not resolve to an active website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

5.1 For the purposes of this section of this Decision, the Expert has summarised the submissions of the Parties but only insofar as they are relevant to the matters that the Expert is required to determine under the Policy.

5.2 In summary, the Complainant submitted that the Complaint should succeed for the reasons below.

The Complainant's Rights

- The Complainant holds various internationally registered trade marks connected with the Services and Products.

- As a result of the extensive promotion of the “COMMSCOPE” brand and Mark, the Complainant has developed substantial goodwill and customer loyalty since at least 1969. The Complainant has been featured and has received various awards for its communications solutions, including in 2015 and 2016.

- The Domain Name contains the Complainant's Mark, but with the deletion of a single letter "M". Omitting the "M" from the Domain Name does not distinguish the Domain Name from the Mark.

- The addition of a top-level domain (.co.uk) to the Mark is not a distinguishing feature.

Abusive Registration

- The Complainant has not authorised or licensed the Respondent to use the Mark, COMMSCOPE is a coined term with no independent meaning, and there is no credible explanation for the Respondent's selection of the Domain Name other than a deliberate attempt to exploit the Complainant's Mark.

- The Respondent knew of the Complainant before it registered the Domain Name. The use of "COMSCOPE" adds to the confusion in that the use of the term gives the impression that the Domain Name relates to the Complainant, which is not accurate.

- The Respondent's registration of the Domain Name capitalises on the typographical error of an Internet user who mistakenly types "COMSCOPE" instead of "COMMSCOPE." The removal of the single "M" letter constitutes typosquatting which is itself evidence of an abusive registration.

- The Respondent's registration of the Domain Name trades on the Complainant's goodwill associated with its Mark and disrupts the Complainant's business by diverting consumers who are searching for the Complainant's website but they mistype the Domain Name.

- Because "COMMSCOPE" is a coined term with no independent meaning, there is no credible explanation for the Respondent's selection of the Domain Name other than a deliberate attempt to exploit the Complainant's Mark and divert the consumers who mistype "COMMSCOPE".

- The Respondent's failure to use the Domain Name in connection with any legitimate website shows that it does not have a legitimate right to the name and the Respondent has never placed any active content on the website associated with the Domain Name (the "Website").

- The Policy provides factors that may be evidence that the Domain Name is not an Abusive Registration, but none of these factors apply to the registration of the Domain Name.

5.3 No response was provided by the Respondent.

6. Discussion and Findings

General

6.1 To succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant has to prove that, pursuant to paragraph 2 of the Policy, on the balance of probabilities:

6.1.1. [It] has Rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the Domain Name; and

6.1.2. The Domain Name, in the hands of the Respondent, is an Abusive Registration.

6.2 Addressing each of these limbs in turn:

Rights in respect of a name or mark which is identical or similar to the Domain Name

6.3 The Expert considers that, for the reasons below, the requirement set out in paragraph 2.1.1 of the Policy is met.

6.4 Paragraph 1 of the Policy defines “Rights” as:

> […] rights enforceable by the Complainant, whether under English law or otherwise, and may include rights in descriptive terms which have acquired a secondary meaning.

6.5 The Expert notes that the Complainant is the proprietor of a number of registered trade marks for the Mark, and considers that, based on the evidence provided by the Complainant regarding its awards and recognition, the Complainant has built an international reputation in providing its Services and Products.

6.6 Noting the above, the Expert considers that, disregarding the Domain Name suffix “.co.uk” for this purpose and the intentional typo of the missing “M”, the Complainant has Rights in respect of a name or mark identical to the Domain Name.

Abusive Registration

6.7 For the reasons set out below, the Expert considers that the Domain Name is an Abusive Registration as defined by the Policy.

6.8 Paragraph 1 of the Policy defines "Abusive Registration" as a domain name which either:

> i. was registered or otherwise acquired in a manner which, at the time when the registration or acquisition took place, took unfair advantage of or was unfairly detrimental to the Complainant’s Rights; or
>
> ii. is being or has been used in a manner which has taken unfair advantage of or has been unfairly detrimental to the Complainant’s Rights.

6.9 In relation to the definition of Abusive Registration in sub paragraph (i), the Policy, at paragraph 5, sets out a non-exhaustive list of factors which may be evidence that the Domain Name is an Abusive Registration.

6.10 Specifically, the Expert considers that the factor set out at paragraph 5.1.1.3 of the Policy (registered primarily for the purpose of unfairly disrupting the business of the Complainant) is relevant.

6.11 Noting the Complainant’s international goodwill and reputation, as addressed at paragraph 6.5 above, and that the Domain Name is identical to the Mark, other than the missing “M”, the Expert considers that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its business and specifically chose to register the Domain Name to take advantage of the Complainant’s goodwill and reputation, with the intention of disrupting and/or profiting from the Complainant's business.

6.12 Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the Expert considers that the registration of the Domain Name took unfair advantage of, and was unfairly detrimental to, the Complainant’s Rights.

6.13 So far as the definition of Abusive Registration in sub paragraph (ii) is concerned, the Expert considers that the Domain Name was and is an Abusive Registration as a result of its manner of use by the Respondent, for the reasons explained below.

6.14 Specifically, the Expert considers that the factor set out at paragraph 5.1.2, “the Respondent is using […] the Domain Name in a way which has confused or is likely to confuse people or businesses into believing that the Domain Name is registered to, operated or authorised by, or otherwise connected with the Complainant”, is relevant.

6.15 As set out in Nominet's DRS Experts' Overview (3rd edition, paragraph 3.3), the 'confusion' referred to in this factor is confusion as to the identity of the person/entity behind the Website, the Expert considers this is so even where the Domain Name does not resolve to an active Website.

6.16 On the balance of probabilities, the Expert considers that anyone trying to access the Website would likely be confused, at least initially, into thinking that the Website is connected with the Complainant, with the Complainant potentially losing sales of its Services and Products, and valuable reputation, by such confusion.

6.17 Furthermore, the Expert considers that the factor set out at paragraph 5.1.6 is relevant, namely: "The Domain Name is an exact match (within the limitations of the character set permissible in domain names) for the name or mark in which the Complainant has Rights, the Complainant's mark has a reputation and the Respondent has no reasonable justification for having registered [it]."

6.18 In this regard, paragraph 6.6 above sets out that the Domain Name is identical to the Mark, paragraph 6.5 above sets out the Expert's view that the Complainant has a reputation in the Mark and, in the Expert's view, the "Respondent has shown no reasonable justification for having registered the Domain Name."

6.19 The Expert has considered whether there is any evidence before him to demonstrate that the Domain Name is not an Abusive Registration, including whether the Respondent is making fair use of the Domain Name, but does not consider there is.

6.20 Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the Expert considers that the use of the Domain Name takes unfair advantage of, and is unfairly detrimental to, the Complainant's Rights.

7. Decision

7.1 For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 18 of the Policy, the Expert orders that the Domain Name <comscope.co.uk> be transferred to the Complainant.

Dr Russell Richardson
Expert
Date: 12 November 2026