

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Vinod Cookware India Private Limited v. shenyan257 shenyan257
Case No. D2024-1908

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Vinod Cookware India Private Limited, India, represented by Kayser & Company, India.

The Respondent is shenyan257 shenyan257, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <vinodcookware.shop> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2024. On May 7, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 8, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 8, 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 amended Complaint on May 9, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 May 17, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 6, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 10, 2024.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on June 19, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant provides the services of trading, retailing, and wholesaling of household utensils. In 2000 the Complainant commenced its business of manufacturing and selling cookware, tableware, and serve ware, household utensils, aluminum non-stick and hard anodized cookware, pressure cookers and non-electric equipment. The Complainant has a substantive turnover of sales.

The Complainant has traded under different marks, some of them including the terms VINOD and “cookware”, such as UK trademark registration UK00003569197 (registered on July 2, 2021, and European Union trademark number 018320828 (registered on March 6, 2021). The Complainant has registered the domain name <vinodcookware.com> in 2013 and <vinodcookware.uk> in 2023.

The Domain Name was registered on June 27, 2022. The Domain Name resolved to a website on which the Respondent purports to be - or connected to - the Complainant. The Respondent’s website makes available goods identical to the Complainant’s goods.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has not been granted any authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent’s use of the Domain Name is not bona fide. The Respondent is passing off as the Complainant.

The Complainant believes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Complainant argues that the Domain Name is designed to mislead its users for commercial gain by diverting consumers from the Complainant. The Complainant has received e-mails from customers mistaking the Complainant for the Respondent.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in trademarks including the terms VINOD and “cookware”. The domain name incorporates parts of the Complainant’s trademarks. When assessing identity or confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a 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.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent’s use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent’s use is evidence of bad faith, see below. Finally, the Panel finds that the composition of the Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

The Respondent most likely knew of the Complainant when he registered the Domain Name. It follows from the composition and use of the Domain Name. The Respondent’s use of the Domain Name indicates fraudulent intent. Moreover, the Respondent has not offered any explanation as to why it registered the Domain Name, nor provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. In the context of this case, the Respondent’s use of a privacy service further points to bad faith.

Based on the available record, 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 the Domain Name <vinodcookware.shop> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: July 3, 2024