

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The McKenzie Corporation Limited v. yanran du
Case No. D2025-5363

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The McKenzie Corporation Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Murgitroyd & Company, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is yanran du, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mckenziee.com> 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 22, 2025. On December 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 23, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 24, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 29, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 January 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on February 4, 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 sportswear company with its headquarters in the United Kingdom.

The Complainant is the owner of several MCKENZIE trade marks including the following:

- United Kingdom Trade Mark MCKENZIE number UK00902664423 registered on November 4, 2011; and
- United Kingdom Trade Mark MCKENZIE number UK00002379819 registered on July 29, 2005.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 9, 2025 and it points to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's mark, and purporting to sell the Complainant's products as well as the products of direct competitors of 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 mere addition of the letter "e" to the Complainant's MCKENZIE trade mark in the disputed domain name does not prevent confusing similarity between the Complainant's trade mark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that it has no business or other relationship with the Respondent. The Complainant states that it has not consented to the registration of the disputed domain name or its subsequent use by the Respondent. The Complainant submits that to the best of its knowledge, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not making legitimate, noncommercial, or fair use of the disputed domain name as the Respondent is using the disputed domain name with the intent of misleading consumers and/or harming the reputation enjoyed by the Complainant.

Turning to bad faith, the Complainant points to the significant online visibility of its MCKENZIE trade mark including via the JD Sports website, to conclude that it is not plausible that the Respondent would not have been aware of the Complainant's trade mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also highlights the fact that the disputed domain name and associated website will mislead Internet users into thinking that the disputed domain name and associated website are somehow affiliated with, endorsed or authorized by the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the MCKENZIE trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The mere addition of the letter "e" after the Complainant's trade mark in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 3.1](#), 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trade mark given (i) the online visibility of the MCKENZIE trade mark of the Complainant, including via the JD Sports website, and (ii) the fact that the disputed domain name has been registered some twenty years after the MCKENZIE trade mark.

Turning to use in bad faith, the disputed domain name and associated website are clearly designed to mislead Internet users into thinking that the disputed domain name and associated website are somehow affiliated with, endorsed or authorized by the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

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 <mckenziee.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: February 18, 2026