

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

W.W. Grainger, Inc. v. 郭星 (Guo Xing)
Case No. D2023-2773

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 郭星 (Guo Xing), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <graingersupply.online> is registered with DNSPod, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 29, 2023. On June 30, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 3, 2023, 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 FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 26, 2023, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed the first amended Complaint in English on July 31, 2023.

On July 26, 2023, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On August 8, 2023, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding and submitted the second amended Complaint in English. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 the Respondent in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 9, 2023. In accordance with the

Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 29, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 1, 2023.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on September 12, 2023. 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 a publicly traded company on the New York and Chicago Stock Exchanges, active in the Maintenance Repair & Operations (MRO) industry. It was founded over 85 years ago and has large international business operations, with more than 30 million MRO products offered globally, 353 branches, over 26,000 employees worldwide, and over USD 15.2 billion in annual sales.

The Complainant provides evidence that it owns an international portfolio of registered trademarks for GRAINGER. These registrations include, but are not limited to, United States Trademark Registration number 1,559,199 for GRAINGER, registered on October 3, 1989; and Chinese Trademark Registration No. 1122583 for GRAINGER, registered on October 28, 1997. The Complainant also has a strong online presence and provides its products via its official websites hosted at various official domain names including <grainger.com> and <graingersupply.com>, which currently resolve to a website from which the Complainant's products can be purchased.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 26, 2022, and is therefore of a later date than the abovementioned trademarks of the Complainant. The Complainant submits evidence that the disputed domain name previously directed to an active webpage impersonating the Complainant by adopting the same branding and using the same look and feel of the Complainant's official website by, *inter alia*, using the Complainant's trademarks and similar toolbars, products categories, and images. However, the Panel notes that on the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name directs to an inactive webpage.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademark for GRAINGER, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered, and is being used in bad faith to divert Internet users to the Respondent's webpage which impersonates the Complainant.

The Complainant essentially contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's internationally famous trademarks as it incorporates the Complainant's GRAINGER trademark in its entirety, with the only differing element being the addition of the term "supply" to the disputed domain name. The Complainant also argues that the disputed domain name was diverting Internet traffic to a website that impersonated the Complainant's website. The Complainant particularly contends that the website at the disputed domain name adopts the same look and feel of the Complainant's website and branding by using the Complainant's trademark and similar toolbars, products categories, and images to create the same commercial impression as the Complainant's, which, the Complainant argues, confers no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent, and which means that the Respondent is gaining a commercial benefit through such use of the Complainant's marks. The Complainant also argues that the Respondent had or can be expected to have had prior notice of the

Complainant's trademarks at the time the disputed domain name was registered, since the Complainant registered its trademarks for GRAINGER many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name and since these marks are internationally well known, including in the Respondent's jurisdiction China. The Complainant essentially contends that the registration and use of the disputed domain name in such circumstances constitutes registration and use in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Preliminary issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name contains English words in Latin script, rather than Chinese script, the fact that, the disputed domain name wholly contains the term "grainger", which is identical to the Complainant's GRAINGER mark and because the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage entirely in English.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the Registration Agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both Parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the Parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time, and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here, “supply”, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

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.

While 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 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The 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.

The Panel notes that, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to connect it to a website impersonating the Complainant by adopting the same branding and using the same look and feel of the Complainant’s website by, *inter alia*, using the Complainant’s trademarks and similar toolbars, products categories, and images.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (*e.g.*, the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

However, the Panel notes that on the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name directs to an inactive webpage. In this regard, the Panel finds that holding a domain name passively, without making any use of it, also does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#); and *Vente-Privee.Com and Vente-Privee.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1685](#)).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered a domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s internationally famous trademarks (prior UDRP panels have held that the GRAINGER marks are internationally well known, see *W.W. Grainger, Inc. v. Domain Administrator, Fundacion Privacy Services LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1627](#)). The Panel deducts from this fact that by

registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent deliberately and consciously targeted the Complainant's prior trademarks for GRAINGER. The Panel finds that this creates a presumption of bad faith. In this regard, the Panel refers to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4, which states “[p]anelists have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.” Furthermore, the Panel also notes that the Complainant's trademarks for GRAINGER were registered many years before the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Panel deducts from these elements that the Respondent knew, or at least should have known, of the existence of the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. In the Panel's view, these elements clearly indicate bad faith on the part of the Respondent, and the Panel therefore finds that it has been demonstrated that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As to use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Panel notes that, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to connect it to a website impersonating the Complainant by adopting the same branding and using the same look and feel of the Complainant's website by, *inter alia*, using the Complainant's trademarks and similar toolbars, products categories, and images.

Panels have held that the disputed domain name is used to intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement constitutes bad faith. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

However, on the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name links to an inactive website.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. While panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <graingersupply.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: September 20, 2023