

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Woods Equipment Company v. gina wiegmann  
Case No. D2026-0048

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Woods Equipment Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Foley & Lardner, United States.

Respondent is gina wiegmann, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <woodsequipments.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 January 7, 2026. On January 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 12, 2026, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on January 13, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on January 14, 2026.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 4, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on February 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on February 11, 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**

Complainant, Woods Equipment Company, is a United States based company in the business of manufacturing and selling tractor attachments and replacement parts for the agricultural and grounds maintenance industries. Complainant owns and uses the house mark WOODS in connection with its products. In the United States, Complainant owns a trademark registration for the WOODS mark (Registration No. 1187361, that issued to registration on January 26, 1982) and WOODS WAY (Registration No. 6996744, that issues to registration on March 7, 2023). Complainant also owns a pending application in the United States for a stylized version of WOODS (Application No. 99423620, that was filed on October 1, 2025). Lastly, Complainant owns and uses the domain name <woodsequipment.com> for a website concerning Complainant and its products.

Respondent, who appears to be based in the United States, registered the disputed domain name on November 29, 2025. At some point thereafter, the disputed domain name redirected and resolved to Complainant's website at <woodsequipment.com>. That redirect currently continues.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that it is well known to consumers where Complainant operates and that it has strong rights in the WOODS mark by virtue of its use of the WOODS mark since 1982 as a house mark, its extensive sales and promotion of goods under the WOODS house mark and its trademark registrations and application that include the WOODS mark.

Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar as it fully incorporates the WOODS mark in its entirety. Complainant further asserts that the inclusion of the word "equipment" with the letter "s" at the tail of the disputed domain name is of no import and is, in fact, an intentional attempt to create confusion with Complainant's <woodsequipment.com> domain name.

Complainant maintains that Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as Respondent (i) is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, (ii) has no rights in the WOODS trademark, and (iii) has not made a bona fide use or legitimate non-commercial fair use of the disputed domain name. In that regard, Complainant notes that it was contacted by one of its customers who advised that it had received email messages using the disputed domain name attempting to impersonate Complainant to obtain financial payments. Complainant also maintains that the disputed domain name has simply been used by Respondent as a redirection to Complainant's website at the "www.woodsequipment.com".

Lastly, Complainant argues that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith as Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to impersonate Complainant and "to confuse Complainant-WOODS's customers with nearly identical contact information in an attempt to obtain unauthorized money payments from contacted customers."

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") at section 1.7. Complainant has provided evidence that it owns a trademark registration for the WOODS mark and that it has made extensive use of the WOODS mark, and developed common law rights in such, well before Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

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. *Id.*

Here, the WOODS mark is fully incorporated and clearly visible in the disputed domain name. Although the addition of the word "equipment" with an additional letter "s" at the tail of the disputed domain name may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the WOODS mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel thus finds that 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 a 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 that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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.

Here, the disputed domain name is clearly based on Complainant's WOODS mark. The addition of "equipments" after the WOODS mark at the tail of the disputed domain name makes it more likely than not that the disputed domain name will mistakenly be seen by consumers as related to Complainant and its products. This is particularly so given that Complainant uses the domain name <woodsequipment.com> for its primary website and given that the disputed domain name merely redirects to Complainant's actual website. In all, the disputed domain name effectively impersonates Complainant and thus, on its face, carries a risk of implied affiliation. As such, it is hard to see how Respondent could have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 2.5.1.

Further confirming Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name is the use of the disputed domain name by Respondent for emails attempting to solicit payments from Complainant's customers. While Complainant did not provide evidence of any such emails or solicitations, Complainant did provide a sworn declaration from a director, an employee of Complainant attesting that one of Complainant's customers had contacted Complainant about receiving emails using the disputed domain name that impersonated Complainant in an attempt to obtain financial payments. Given that Respondent has not appeared in the proceeding to contest the matter or to otherwise justify its actions, the Panel accepts that it is more likely than not that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an attempt to divert payments to be made to Complainant. Such illicit efforts, to be sure, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Based on the foregoing, 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 view of Respondent's actions, and failure to appear in this proceeding, it seems more likely than not that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name has been done opportunistically and in bad faith for Respondent's benefit or profit. Respondent's bad faith is underscored by Respondent's registration of a typo version of Complainant's primary domain name, <woodsequipment.com>, and the use of such as a redirect to Complainant's website. Moreover, the fact that Respondent appears to be using the disputed domain name for emails that impersonate Complainant in an effort to obtain financial payments from Complainant's customers further underscores Respondent's bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. In all, Respondent was undoubtedly aware of Complainant and its WOODS name and mark when it registered the disputed domain name that essentially copies Complainant's WOODS mark and <woodsequipment.com> domain name in furtherance of a likely fraudulent scheme.

The Panel thus 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 disputed domain name <woodsequipments.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Georges Nahitchevansky/*

**Georges Nahitchevansky**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 20, 2026