

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DSSS Enterprises, Inc. v. Pan Ren, SPELAB
Case No. D2026-0139

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DSSS Enterprises, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Sisson & Banyas, Attorneys at Law, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Pan Ren, SPELAB, China, represented by King & Wood Mallesons Shanghai Office, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <spelabautoparts.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 13, 2026. On January 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Unknown Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 16, 2026, 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 the same day.

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 January 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 9, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on February 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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 United States-based manufacturer and distributor of automotive customization and restoration parts. Founded in 2011, the Complainant develops, manufactures, and distributes a variety of air intake systems, fuel systems, engine components, and interior and exterior components primarily for F-Series trucks and Ford Mustangs. The Complainant holds the following United States trademark registrations:

- Trademark registration number 7396256 for SPE MOTORSPORT and device, registered on May 28, 2024 (application filed on February 15, 2023) with claims of first use in commerce on July 1, 2018, specifying certain automotive parts and other goods and services in classes 7, 11, 40, and 41; and
- Trademark registration number 7396257 for SPE MOTORSPORT, registered on May 28, 2024, (application filed on February 15, 2023) with claims of first use in commerce on July 1, 2018, specifying certain automotive parts and other goods and services in classes 7, 11, 40, and 41.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant has also filed the following United States trademark applications:

- Trademark application number 98670583 for SPE, filed on July 29, 2024, with a claim of first use in commerce on July 1, 2018, specifying services in class 35; and
- Trademark application number 98670591 for a stylized SPE mark, filed on July 29, 2024, with claims of first use in commerce on July 1, 2011, specifying goods and services in classes 7, 12, 35, and 41.

The above trademark applications are currently pending. The Complainant also uses the domain name <spemotorsport.com> in connection with its website in English that displays the SPE MOTORSPORT and device mark and offers its products for sale.

The Respondent is identified in the Registrar's Whois database as an individual based in China ("Pan Ren") together with the denomination "SPELAB". He formerly held United States trademark registration number 5960541 for SPELAB, registered on January 14, 2020 (application filed on July 1, 2019), with a claim of first use in commerce on April 1, 2019, specifying goods in class 12, including accessories and motorcycle parts, which do not appear to be sold on the website associated with the disputed domain name. He assigned his entire interest in that trademark registration to a company named Hangzhou Weihong Technology Co., Ltd ("杭州维宏科技有限公司") by a deed of assignment dated July 2, 2020, that was recorded in the register on July 9, 2020. The Response also annexes a certificate dated January 14, 2020 (i.e., prior to the assignment) by which Hangzhou Weihong Technology Co., Ltd (which was not yet the registered proprietor) purportedly granted a license of that trademark to Source Prestige Development Limited ("源威发展有限公司"). The Response refers to the latter company as the respondent in this proceeding.

The Panel also notes that another SPELAB mark held by Hangzhou Weihong Technology Co., Ltd has been cancelled. United States trademark registration number 6286926, registered on March 9, 2021 with a claim of first use in commerce on July 1, 2020, specified goods in class 7, including air filters for automobile engines, of types that appear to be sold on the website associated with the disputed domain name. This trademark registration was cancelled on June 3, 2024 at the petition of the Complainant, based on its prior

trademark registration for SPE MOTORSPORT.¹

The disputed domain name was registered on August 21, 2019. It resolves to a website in English displaying the SPELAB trademark with a panther head logo, offering for sale aftermarket engine, drivetrain, chassis, and interior and exterior components. These include products of differing capacities for Ford Powerstroke, Duramax and Ram vehicles. One of the products for Ford Powerstroke is described as a “CCV Recirculating Kit”. Products are branded “SPELAB” with the panther head logo. Prices are displayed in USD. The website operator is identified as Source Prestige Development Limited at an address in Hong Kong, China.

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 or, in the alternative, the cancellation of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered and pending SPE marks.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant’s mark and domain name were coined by the Complainant with no meaning other than to identify the Complainant’s company and brand. The Respondent is not associated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not authorized the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to pass itself off as the Complainant so that it may offer unauthorized products and/or divert customers to purchase products from the Respondent as opposed to the Complainant.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to market and sell products identical to the Complainant’s products while also utilizing images and product descriptions lifted from the Complainant’s website (in particular, a CCV Recirculating Kit) so that the Respondent may pass the disputed domain name off as being sponsored by, or affiliated with, the Complainant when no such sponsorship or affiliation exists.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied any of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer or cancellation of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends that the disputed domain name is neither identical nor confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. The core portion of the disputed domain name shares only the letters “spe” with the trademarks and do not carry any special meaning. The remaining letters visually dominate the combination. The disputed domain name and the trademarks are significantly different in spelling, pronunciation, and meaning. Consumers interested in a particular brand usually tend to pay more attention to the URL when viewing a website. If confusing similarity were established solely because the disputed domain name begins with “spe”, this would effectively bar others from using any domain name beginning with “spe”. Given the fact that the Respondent in this case operates the SPELAB brand lawfully and holds a valid registered trademark, there is no reasonable basis to conclude that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks.

¹The Panel notes its general powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules and has searched the United States Patent and Trademark Office trademark register, which is a matter of public record, because the Respondent submitted evidence of its original trademark registration and subsequent deed of assignment. The Panel considers this process of corroboration useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

The Respondent has rights and legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. SPELAB is a brand independently created by the Respondent, coined by combining the first three letters of the English words “speed” and “laboratory”. Rather than an imitation of any third-party identifier, the brand name was originally conceived by the Respondent, who held multiple rounds of internal discussions regarding the trademark icon, typography, brand colors and the official website’s overall design. The Respondent’s founder obtained registration of the SPELAB trademark, which was later transferred to Hangzhou Weihong Technology Co., Ltd., which granted a license to the Respondent for the purpose of cross-border e-commerce operations in the United States. The trademark registration specifies goods in class 12, including the automotive parts and components sold on the website associated with the disputed domain name. The Respondent also obtained legal authorization to sell SPELAB-branded products protected by a United States design patent. The disputed domain name is used by the Respondent based on the licensed trademark and other legitimate rights arising out of genuine business needs. All products sold by the Respondent under the SPELAB mark are legitimate products independently developed and legally marketed by the Respondent. Through years of dedicated efforts, the Respondent has built a reputation for the SPELAB brand and products.

The disputed domain name has not been registered and is not being used in bad faith. Firstly, the Complainant’s allegation of bad faith is based solely on alleged “product copying” but the structure and appearance of the CCV Recirculating Kit is a generic design necessary to achieve specific functionality. Many similar products with a highly comparable appearance are available on other websites. Secondly, the Respondent purchased the disputed domain name on Shopify because it incorporated the Respondent’s SPELAB brand and trademark, which constitutes a legitimate and independent business purpose. Since then, the Respondent has been properly using the complete SPELAB mark in its sales and operations made through the website associated with the disputed domain name, without using or emphasizing SPE separately. The website using the disputed domain name properly uses the commercial identifiers of the Respondent, and its layout is significantly different from the Complainant’s website. The Respondent also clearly discloses its identity as a Hong Kong, China corporation, presenting significant distinctions from the Complainant in terms of geographical location and business background. Judging from reviews and feedback, there is no indication of consumers being misled or confused about the source of products due to the disputed domain name or website content. In its advertising placements, the Respondent explicitly displays its complete brand identifier SPELAB and never separately uses SPE as a keyword to attract traffic. The Respondent is in full compliance with its tax obligations. The Respondent currently holds only two domain names (the disputed domain name and <spelabracing.com>), both of which are directly associated with the SPELAB brand. There is no evidence of any malicious cybersquatting, domain name hoarding, or interference with others’ trademark rights.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must demonstrate 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; 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 burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. Failure to demonstrate any one element will result in denial of the Complaint.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of a SPE MOTORSPORT and device trademark and a SPE MOTORSPORT wordmark. Those rights existed at the relevant time for the purposes of the first element of the Policy, which was when the Complaint was filed. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.1.3 and 1.2.1. Although the Complainant has also provided evidence of pending trademark applications for SPE and a stylized SPE mark, pending trademark applications do not of themselves demonstrate rights for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.4. In the circumstances of this case, it is sufficient for the Panel to compare the disputed domain name with the SPE MOTORSPORT and device trademark for the purposes of the first element of the Policy.

A dominant feature of the SPE MOTORSPORT and device trademark (i.e., the letters "SPE") is reproduced within the disputed domain name as its initial element. Despite the addition in the disputed domain name of the syllable "lab" (short for "laboratory") and the terms "auto parts", this dominant feature of the SPE MOTORSPORT and device trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. As the figurative elements of that mark cannot be reproduced in a domain name, they may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. The only other additional element in the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy as well. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the SPE MOTORSPORT and device mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, 1.10, and 1.11.1.

The Respondent argues that this conclusion would effectively bar others from using any domain name beginning with "spe". However, the Panel recalls that the first element only concerns the standing requirement in the Policy; it does not prejudge the outcome of this proceeding, which depends on an assessment of the other elements of the Policy.

The Respondent argues that the actual usage of both a trademark and a domain name is "typically" taken into consideration when assessing confusing similarity. However, this test under the first element of the Policy is narrower than, and thus different from, the question of "likelihood of confusion" under trademark law. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The Panel can consider the Parties' respective websites under the second and third elements of the Policy, to the extent relevant.

Therefore, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Given the Panel's findings regarding the third element of the Policy in Section 6C below, it is unnecessary to consider the second element.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel recalls that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy sets out two conjunctive requirements, according to which the Complainant must demonstrate both that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and also that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. As regards bad faith registration, the Complainant needs to show that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's mark at the time when the disputed domain name was registered.

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2019, five years before the registration of the Complainant's marks. There is no claim of prior unregistered trademark rights. The Panel recalls that, where a registrant registers a domain name before a complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels will not normally find bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.1.

The Panel has considered the possibility of exceptional circumstances in which the Respondent acted in anticipation of the Complainant's nascent rights in the SPE MOTORSPORT and device mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2. However, the disputed domain name was registered over three years before the application to register the Complainant's mark was filed. The only assertion on the record that the mark was used prior to 2019 is the claim of first use in commerce included in the trademark registration. The only evidence of actual use of the mark is the current use on the Complainant's website. In these circumstances, the Panel does not find that there is evidence that the Complainant's mark was being targeted at the time when the disputed domain name was registered.

Moreover, the Panel finds no evidence that the Respondent has reproduced images from the Complainant's website.

These findings are without prejudice to potential claims of trademark infringement or unfair competition, which may be resolved by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Therefore, the Panel does not find the third element of the Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: February 27, 2026