

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Revolutionrace AB v. Fashion Style Way  
Case No. D2024-1515

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Revolutionrace AB, Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Fashion Style Way, United States of America ("U.S.").

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <revolutionraceshop.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 10, 2024. On April 10, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 11, 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 (Registrant Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 17, 2024, 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 17, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 23, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 13, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 25, 2024.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on June 4, 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**

The Complainant is a Swedish company (founded in 2014) offering multifunctional products including clothes, shoes, backpacks and accessories.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks, including U.S. Reg. No. 5866459 for REVOLUTIONRACE (registered on September 24, 2019) and European Union Reg. No. 018003620 for “Revolutionrace” (registered on April 20, 2019).

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on February 7, 2024, and, at the time of filing of the Complaint, resolved to a landing page featuring pay-per-click links.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has not submitted any reply to the 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.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here “shop”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

The Panel finds that 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.

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 that 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 the 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 also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's mark in its entirety together with the term "shop", creates a risk of implied affiliation.

The Panel finds that 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.

Under the circumstances of this case, including the composition of the disputed domain name, it can be inferred that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The evidence and allegations submitted by the Complainant support a finding that the Respondent was engaged in an attempt to attract Internet users to its website for its own commercial gain. The Respondent therefore used the disputed domain name in bad faith (see *Claudie Pierlot v. Yinglong Ma*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-2466](#)).

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element 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 <revolutionraceshop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Tobias Zuberbühler/*

**Tobias Zuberbühler**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2024