

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dansko, LLC v. song lin
Case No. D2025-4495

1. The Parties

Complainant is Dansko, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Cozen O'Connor, United States.

Respondent is song lin, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <danskois-us.shop> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 30, 2025. On October 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. That same day, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 3, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 5, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 26, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on November 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Harrie R. Samaras 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

Since 1990, Complainant has provided comfort footwear to customers internationally including by way of the domain name <dansko.com>. Complainant owns various trademark registrations for its DANSKO Mark (or the “Mark”) including the United States Trademark Registration No. 2,712,957 (registered on May 6, 2003) and 3,854,991 (registered on September 28, 2010). Complainant also owns registrations for the combination of the DANSKO mark with a logo (“Combined Mark”), for example, the United States Trademark Registration No. 2,712,953 (registered on May 6, 2003).

The Domain Name was registered on September 23, 2025. It resolves to a website (the “Website”) that uses the DANSKO Mark throughout prominently referring to the name of the business as the slightly misspelled “Danskos”. The Website also uses the Combined Mark prominently on each page like Complainant does on the website associated with its domain name. The shoes offered for sale on the Website look to be the same as the shoes that Complainant is selling on its website, and Respondent uses the same names for the shoes that Complainant uses. Also, the photographs of the shoes on the Website look exactly the same as the photographs of the shoes on Complainant’s website. Moreover, in some instances when you click on a photo of a shoe on the Website, a photograph of the shoe as worn by a person is shown and it is the same photograph that exists on Complainant’s website for the same shoe. The more general photographs on the Website also have the same look as those on Complainant’s website. Generally, the price of the same looking shoes on the Website is cheaper than the same shoes on Complainant’s website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. Notably, Complainant contends the following:

The Domain Name is virtually identical to the Mark apart from the descriptive terms “is” and “us”, which do nothing to distinguish the Domain Name from the Mark. Those additions increase the likelihood of confusion, as they indicate the Domain Name is a place to shop for Complainant’s shoes in the United States, where Complainant is based. Nor does the fact that the Domain Name uses a new generic Top-Level Domain “.shop” create a meaningful distinction from the Mark.

Respondent has anonymously registered the Domain Name to evade the consequences of registering it for which he/she has no rights or legitimate interests. The Panel may draw adverse inferences from Respondent’s use of a privacy or proxy registration service to register the Domain Name. According to the Registrar, Respondent’s name is “song lin”. Respondent is not commonly known as “Dansko” or any of the terms in the Domain Name. There is no evidence of any connection between Respondent and the Domain Name. Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or endorsed Respondent’s use of the Mark in the Domain Name. The Domain Name resolves to a website with infringing content, prominently featuring Complainant’s Mark and designs, and purporting to offer Complainant’s own footwear goods.

Respondent registered the Domain Name long after Complainant first began advertising and using the Mark in connection with its goods and services, and after Complainant registered the Mark in the United States. Respondent clearly had Complainant in mind when registering the Domain Name because Respondent had constructive notice of the registrations for the Mark and the Domain Name contains the identical Mark. Furthermore, the Website prominently features the Mark and the Combined Mark, and purports to sell Complainant’s footwear in competition with or to imitate Complainant.

Bad faith is further evidenced by Respondent concealing its true identity by registering the Domain Name through a privacy service. Considered in light of the illegitimate selection and limited use of the Domain Name, this supports the inference that Respondent has knowingly engaged in the registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith. Moreover, it is apparent that Respondent registered the Domain Name to trade-off of Complainant's goodwill in the Mark and to confuse consumers into believing that Respondent's Domain Name is affiliated or associated with Complainant. Given that Respondent also chose to attach a descriptive phrase at the end of the Mark in the Domain Name it is likely that Respondent plans to use this domain name in attempts to fraudulently obtain personally identifiable information from individuals believing that the Domain Name is actually related to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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.

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 Domain Name. Accordingly, the 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, "is-us" to the end of the DANSKO mark 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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

It is undisputed that Respondent is not commonly known by a name corresponding to the Domain Name, indeed Respondent's name according to the Whois records is song lin. Also, Complainant has not authorized Respondent to use the Mark for any purpose including to register the Domain Name. Furthermore, the Domain Name has been used in connection with the Website which as described above is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services or a noncommercial legitimate or fair use of the Mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as the possible sale of counterfeit goods and passing itself off as Complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Respondent registered the Domain Name at least twenty years after Complainant obtained a registration in the United States for the Mark. Respondent is not only using the Mark, it is also using the Combination Mark on the Website in the manner described above to sell goods that compete with Complainant's goods. The Panel concludes that Respondent knew of Complainant, its products and its rights in the Mark when it registered the Domain Name.

As indicated above, Respondent has been and continues to use the Domain Name to sell goods that compete with those sold by Complainant under the Mark. By doing so, Respondent is using the Domain Name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to the source, sponsorship, and affiliation.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1. Respondent's attempt to hide its identity is such a circumstance.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, possible sale of counterfeit goods and impersonating Complainant constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <danskois-us.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Harrie R. Samaras/

Harrie R. Samaras

Sole Panelist

Date: December 12, 2025