

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

RealTruck Enterprise, Inc. v. jie xia  
Case No. D2025-4947

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is RealTruck Enterprise, Inc., United States of America (“U.S.”), represented by MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC, U.S.

The Respondent is jie xia, China.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <theextang.com> and <thegorhino.com> are registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 27, 2025. On November 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 1, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 December 3, 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 December 14, 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 December 18, 2025. Shortly after the commencement of the proceedings, the Complainant submitted unsolicited Supplemental Filing on the same day. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Tobias Malte Müller as the sole panelist in this matter on January 22, 2026. 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 operates in the automotive sector.

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is the parent company of the subsidiary entities that own trademark registrations relevant to these proceedings. In particular, the Complainant's wholly owned subsidiary Naade, Inc owns U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,554,591 GO RHINO, registered on June 24, 2014 for goods in class 12; The Complainant's wholly owned further subsidiary Extang Corporation owns U.S. Trademark Registration No. 1,911,255 EXTANG, registered on August 15, 1995 for goods in class 12.

The disputed domain names <theextang.com> and <thegorhino.com> were both registered on June 18, 2024. Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain names resolve to websites advertising the Complainant's products, prominently using the Complainant's registered trademarks and holding itself out as the Complainant, stating

- in relation to the website at <thegorhino.com> "For over 45 years, Go Rhino has been committed to providing our customers with high quality, stylish, and rugged aftermarket truck accessories. Founded in 1975 and headquartered in Duarte, California, we specialize in developing innovative products that enhance the look and performance of trucks and SUVs."; and
- in relation to the website at <theextang.com> "For over 40 years, Extang has been the leader in truck bed covers and accessories. Our mission is to provide innovative, high-quality products that enhance truck owners' experiences and enable them to get the most out of their vehicles."

#### 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- (1) the disputed domain names are materially identical to its subsidiaries' registered trademarks. The Respondent's addition of the word "the" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".com" is insufficient to differentiate the subject domain names from the Complainant's registered trademarks;
- (2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is making use of the disputed domain names in an unauthorized and illegitimate manner to sell goods identical to and competitive with the Complainant's goods. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor is the Respondent authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks. The Respondent is not an authorized distributor, reseller, or service provider of the Complainant. A reseller or distributor can be making a bona fide offering of goods or services and thus have a legitimate interest in the domain name at issue only if certain requirements are met, citing *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). The Respondent has failed to meet the fair use requirements with respect to the disputed domain names. First, the Respondent is not offering the goods for sale at the websites located at the URLs containing the

disputed domain names. Further the Respondent may be selling goods that are not the Complainant's trademarked goods. Finally, and most significantly, the Respondent has taken no steps whatsoever to prevent confusion. The Respondent has not made it clear that he is not the owner of the trademarks and has not accurately disclosed the absence of any relationship with the Complainant. In fact, the Respondent is holding him- or herself out as the trademark owner in the case of both disputed domain names. In relation to the website at <thegorhino.com>, the Respondent states "For over 45 years, Go Rhino has been committed to providing our customers with high-quality, stylish, and rugged aftermarket truck accessories." Likewise, in relation to website at <theextang.com>, the Respondent states "For over 40 years, Extang has been the leader in truck bed covers and accessories." In both cases, the Respondent has failed to indicate any relationship or lack thereof with the Complainant – the legitimate owner of the Trademarks – and has instead illegitimately and deceptively held him- or herself out as the owner of the Trademarks;

- (3) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names each consisting of the word "the" together with one of the Complainant's trademarks. It is easily conceivable that consumers are likely to type in this formulation when seeking to locate the Complainant's website. The Respondent's choice of this formulation is a deliberate attempt to divert Internet traffic from the Complainant's website and to attract such users, for commercial gain, to the Respondent's own websites. In doing so, the Respondent has also created websites that are likely to confuse consumers as to the ownership, sponsorship, and/or affiliation of those websites. Further, the Respondent registered each of the disputed domain names decades after the Complainant or its applicable predecessor-in-interest began use and promotion of each corresponding trademark. This is also evidence of use and registration in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Matters: Further Procedural Considerations**

The Complainant submitted further Supplemental Filing on December 18, 2025, after the Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceeding, in particular Annex 13 showing proof of assignment of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,554,591 GO RHINO from Iddea California, LLC to Naade, Inc. and dating back to 2019.

According to paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence. According to paragraph 10(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall conduct the administrative proceeding in such manner as it considers appropriate in accordance with the Policy and these Rules.

In the case at issue, the Panel considers that the information related to the current ownership of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 4,554,591 GO RHINO is publicly available in the trademark register available online. Annex 13 refers to a transfer of ownership that took place more than five years ago and has been duly recorded in the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") register. Therefore, the supplemental filing added no relevant information to the file that had already been sent to the Respondent. Thus, the Panel does not consider necessary to issue further instructions to the Parties, including a rebuttal/reply opportunity to the non-initiating Party. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.6.

## 6.2 Substantive Matters

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”. Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that each disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (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 Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

### 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 trademarks and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

In accordance with section 1.4.1 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), as the Complainant is the parent company of Naade, Inc that is the owner of GO RHINO trademark registrations and of Extang Corporation that is the owner of EXTANG trademark registrations mentioned above in the Factual Background, the Panel considers that the Complainant has a standing to bring this UDRP proceeding.

The entirety of the marks is reproduced within the disputed domain names, respectively. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term here, “the”, 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 names and the marks 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

According to the Complaint, which has remained unchallenged, the Complainant has no relationship in any way with the Respondent and, in particular, did not authorize the Respondent's use of the trademarks GO RHINO and EXTANG, such as by registering the disputed domain names comprising, respectively, the said trademarks entirely. Furthermore, the Panel notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain names in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, it results from the Complainant's non-contested evidence that the disputed domain names resolve to websites prominently using the Complainant's marks on which the Complainant's goods are advertised and which did not accurately and prominently disclose the lack of the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant; on the contrary holding itself out as the Complainant. Such use cannot be qualified as a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy and the Oki Data test (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)). In fact, it is misleading and diverting consumers, making them erroneously believe that the Respondent is an authorized dealer, retailer, or re-seller of the Complainant's products, and is authorized to promote sales of the Complainant's products.

These findings are reinforced by the following facts: (1) the Respondent did not add any note, information or disclaimer pointing out that it actually has no relationship with the Complainant; (2) the websites are accessible under disputed domain names <theextang.com> and <thegorhino.com> that comprise – respectively - the Complainant's trademark EXTANG and GO RHINO entirely; and (3) the websites do not actually offer for sale the Complainant's products (only advertise them); which does not satisfy the requirements under the Oki Data test, see also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1: "Panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. The Panel recalls that the 'Oki Data test' applies the following cumulative requirements in the specific conditions of a UDRP case: (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue; (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services; (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and (iv) the respondent must not try to 'corner the market' in domain names that reflect the trademark. The Oki Data test does not apply where any prior agreement, express or otherwise, between the parties expressly prohibits (or allows) the registration or use of domain names incorporating the complainant's trademark."

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.

One of these circumstances is that the Respondent by using the disputed domain names, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or online location or of a product or service on its website or online location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, the Complainant's evidence prove – in the Panel's view – that the disputed domain names resolve to websites advertising the Complainant's products, prominently using the Complainant's registered trademarks and holding itself out as the Complainant. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent knew the Complainant's marks. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain names incorporated the Complainant's trademarks when it registered the disputed domain names.

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.

In this regard, the following circumstances surrounding the disputed domain names' registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith:

- (1) the nature of the disputed domain names (incorporating the Complainant's marks entirely plus the addition of the prefix "the");
- (2) the content of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve, advertising the Complainant's products, prominently using the Complainant's registered trademarks and holding itself out as the Complainant;
- (3) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no Response for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain names.

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 names <theextang.com> and <thegorhino.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Tobias Malte Müller/*

**Tobias Malte Müller**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 5, 2026