

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Glen Raven, Inc. v. huang huang
Case No. D2025-4237

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Glen Raven, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Wiley Rein, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is huang huang, the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sunbrella-shop.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 15, 2025. On October 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 17, 2025, 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 (DOMAIN ADMIN, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 27, 2025, 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 November 3, 2025.

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 November 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on December 4, 2025. 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 following facts appear from the Complaint (as amended) and its attached Annexes, which have not been contested by the Respondent:

Founded in 1880 in the United States, the Complainant is one of the leading manufacturers of fabrics, both by the piece and incorporated into finished products in a wide range of applications provided under the trademark SUNBRELLA (the "SUNBRELLA Mark"), including, inter alia, awnings, canopies, umbrellas, footwear, clothing and accessories, marine applications, indoor and outdoor furniture, tents, luggage, and flags.

The Complainant has offices and/or manufacturing facilities located not only in the United States but also in South America, Europe, Africa, and Asia.

The Complainant owns a number of registrations in the United States and around the world for the SUNBRELLA Mark for its fabric products, including the following: United States Registration No. 709,110, SUNBRELLA, registered on December 27, 1960, for "fabrics for awnings, furniture, handbags and sportswear," claiming a date of first use of 1959; United States Registration No. 2,966,133, SUNBRELLA PLUS, registered on July 12, 2005, for "fabrics sold in the piece for use in producing awnings, sun and windscreens, tents, canopies, boat covers and tops, indoor and outdoor furniture and beach umbrellas," claiming a date of first use of 1991; and United States Registration No. 5,474,228, SUNBRELLA, registered on May 22, 2018 for "yarn" and "fabrics for the manufacture of awnings, sun and windscreens, shade sails, tents, canopies, boat covers and tops, indoor and outdoor furniture, beach, garden and market umbrellas, cushions, pillows, area rugs, draperies, sheers, window treatments, automotive applications, namely, headliners and convertible tops, and sports, athletic, tote and golf bags," claiming a date of first use of 1961.

The Complainant also shows it incorporates SUNBRELLA Mark into its official domain name <sunbrella.com>, that since 1998 it has used to access its official website at "www.sunbrella.com" where it offers its products for sale.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 9, 2025, and resolves to a website headed "Furniture" that purports to sell furniture, bags, and home goods. The website appears to be an e-commerce site offering for sale furniture in Lao language with the placeholder text "Modern furniture in a special way Far away, behind the mountains, far from the countries of Vokalia and Consonantia". The Complainant has provided evidence showing that the domain name had previously resolved to a website displaying "Sunbrella Shop" and selling apparel.

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.

Firstly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark of the Complainant.

Secondly, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Thirdly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to the disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark 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.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondent's default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

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.

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 term like "shop" 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.

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.

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 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 finds the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and the addition of the term "shop" which may suggest a connection to the Complainants' sale efforts together with the content previously exhibiting the Complainant's mark affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

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.

The Panel's independent investigation of the disputed domain name found that as of the date visited, December 15, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to what is generally referred to as an ecommerce website which contained some meaningless placeholder sections and offered for sale various home products without disclosing its lack of affiliation with the Complainant.

There is no plausible explanation for the Respondent's selection of a domain name that combines the SUNBRELLA Mark with the descriptive retail term "shop," and use of that domain name to sell in the manner described above products related to the Complainant's products (and previously exhibiting the Complainant's mark on the top of the website), other than an intent to unduly profit from the value of the Complainant's trademark for the Respondent's commercial gain.

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 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 <sunbrella-shop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: December 17, 2026.