

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Retrax Holdings, LLC v. Lin Haihong
Case No. D2025-5270

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Retrax Holdings, LLC, United States of America (the “United States”), represented by MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Lin Haihong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <theretrax.com> (the “Disputed 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 December 17, 2025. On December 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On December 18, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 18, 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 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira as the sole panelist in this matter on January 16, 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 is a limited liability company organized under the laws of Delaware, United States. It is a manufacturer of aftermarket accessories for pick-up trucks and other trucks and vehicles, which have been continuously offered for sale under the trademark RETRAX. The Complainant's products are sold via authorized retail outlets, and also online.

The Complainant is the owner of the trademark RETRAX, registered on November 15, 2016, in the United States under Registration No. 5,081,422, with a claimed first use in commerce dating back to July 1, 1998. The mark is used in connection with retractable truck bed covers and related automotive products.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on June 19, 2024, many years after the Complainant had established trademark rights in RETRAX.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website that prominently displays the RETRAX mark and related branding elements, presents itself in a manner suggestive of an official source, and fails to disclose any absence of relationship with the Complainant.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights on the following grounds. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name on the following grounds, among others.

The Complainant has not granted permission expressly or impliedly for the Respondent to use the RETRAX trademark. There is no license agreement from the Complainant to the Respondent. There is no affiliation or other association of the Respondent with the Complainant.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has any bona fide offering of goods or services under the RETRAX trademark or in connection with the Disputed Domain Name that are unrelated to goods in respect of which the Complainant's trademark is registered. There is no evidence that the Respondent has acquired any trademark or service mark rights of its own. The website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves include unauthorized use of content that originated from the Complainant.

In sum, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its RETRAX trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests therein, and that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit any Response to the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

(i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark RETRAX by virtue of its valid trademark registration and longstanding commercial use.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark RETRAX in its entirety, preceded solely by the definite article "the". The Panel notes that the mere addition of an article "the" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name.

It is well established under the Policy that the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is generally disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity, as it is a technical requirement of domain name registration and does not add any source-distinguishing value.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's RETRAX trademark. Nor is there any indication that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The evidence submitted shows that the Disputed Domain Name is used to host a website that reproduces the Complainant's trademark and branding and presents itself in a manner likely to mislead Internet users as to its source or affiliation. Such use cannot be characterized as a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, particularly in the absence of any accurate disclosure of the lack of relationship with the Complainant.

In the absence of any Response, the Panel finds no basis on which the Respondent could be said to have rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is therefore met.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's RETRAX trademark had been registered and used for many years prior to the registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Given the incorporation of the trademark in its entirety and the manner in which it is used on the associated website, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to intentionally attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Taken together these circumstances support a finding that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <theretrax.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira/

Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira

Sole Panelist

Date: January 31, 2026