

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Target Sports Limited v. li bai
Case No. D2026-0553

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Target Sports Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Sheridans Solicitors, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is li bai, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <targetdartseu.shop> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 10, 2026. On February 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 11, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 11, 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 February 16, 2026.

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 February 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne as the sole panelist in this matter on March 18, 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, incorporated in 1978 and based in the United Kingdom is a manufacturer and supplier of darts products as well as acting as a talent representative agency for professional dart players. It is the operating company for the Target group of companies which includes Gravity Brands Limited. Together the Complainant and the latter company own various trade mark registrations in the European Union ("EU"), United Kingdom ("UK") and China for, or which incorporate, the TARGET word mark. In particular, the Complainant owns EU Trade Mark Registration No. 012681847 registered on August 23, 2015 for a combined word and device which incorporates the word mark TARGET. Its group company, Gravity Brands Limited, owns UK trade mark Registration No. 00003366480 for TARGET DARTS registered on March 29, 2019. The Complainant's official website is at its domain name <target-darts.co.uk> which was registered in 2006 and the Complainant has a strong social media presence. As a result of engaging in business activities across the world and the involvement of its players in world darts championship competitions, the Complainant appears to enjoy an international reputation.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 21, 2025 and prior to being suspended by the Registrar, or website host, at the Complainant's request in December 2025, resolved to a website featuring the Complainant's distinctive device and TARGET word mark. The website included images of darts and page headings for "darts", accessories" and also headings for a "shipping policy", "returns policy", "tracking order" and a detailed but incomplete set of terms of service.

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 wholly incorporates the TARGET DARTS and TARGET marks and is therefore identical or confusingly similar to its trade mark registrations. It submits that the "eu" element, before the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".shop", is a geographical term abbreviation for "European Union" and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant says that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that no authorisation (express or implied) has been provided to the Respondent to register and / or use a domain name incorporating its trade marks and that it has not granted any rights, licence or permission which would entitle the Respondent to incorporate and use its trade marks in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, before it was suspended as a consequence of the Complaint's request to the website host and Registrar, does not amount to a bona fide use of the disputed domain name. It says that the website amounted to a fraudulent imitation of the Complainant's website which features the Complainant's combined word and device mark and images of the Complainant's products and of professional darts players associated with it. The Complainant submits that it was set up as a commercial venture for financial gain in order to confuse and divert Internet users looking for the Complainant's website to the website at the disputed domain name. This says the Complainant does not amount to use of the disputed domain name for legitimate, noncommercial, or fair purposes.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name was registered long after its trade mark registrations and that in the circumstances it is most likely that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's trade marks and business when he registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant points out that the World Darts Championship started in early December approximately two months after the registration of the disputed domain name and that it is most likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the ".shop" TLD and set up the website using the Complainant's trade marks in order to confuse and draw Internet users to its fake website and thereby to take commercial advantage of this event.

The Complainant also notes that the terms of service and contact details for the website are incomplete and inaccurate and it further contends that the Respondent's name and contact details are most likely fake, noting that Li Bai was the name of a well-known Chinese poet many hundreds of years ago. This says the Complainant is a further indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

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 trade mark 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 trade marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. These include, as noted above, a word mark registration for TARGET DARTS and a combined word and device mark including the dominant word element TARGET.

The entirety of the Complainant's (or its group company's) TARGET DARTS mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The dominant element of the Complainant's combined word and device mark is also reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to either mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here "eu", being the common abbreviation for the European Union, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a geographical term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 that 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.

The Complainant has submitted that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that no authorisation (express or implied) has been provided to the Respondent to register and / or use a domain name incorporating its trade marks. It has also said that it has not granted any rights, licence or permission which would entitle the Respondent to incorporate and use its trade marks in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has further submitted that the website to which the disputed domain name resolved before it was suspended by the Registrar does not amount to a bona fide use of the disputed domain name. It has noted that the website amounted to a fraudulent imitation of the Complainant's website in that it featured the Complainant's combined word and device mark and images of the Complainant's products and of certain of the professional darts players associated with the Complainant. The Complainant has submitted that the website at the disputed domain name was set up as a commercial venture for financial gain in order to masquerade as if it was the Complainant's website, or was authorised by it, in order to confuse and divert Internet users seeking the Complainant's website. The Complainant has contended that this does not amount to use of the disputed domain name for legitimate, noncommercial, or fair purposes.

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.

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.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the registration of the Complainant's registered trade marks. The fact that the website to which the disputed domain name initially resolved features the Complainant's distinctive combined device and word mark together with images of the Complainant's products and masquerades as if it is the Complainant's website or has been authorised by it, indicates that it is more than likely that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's trade marks and business when it registered the disputed domain name.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

In this case the Respondent has used the disputed domain name featuring the Complainant's mark to attract Internet users to its own website which is branded as "TARGET" and which features the Complainant's distinctive word and device mark. According to the Complainant, it also features images of the Complainant's products and of professional darts players associated with the Complainant. There is no disclaimer to suggest that the website is neither owned, sponsored by, or affiliated with, the Complainant's business.

The Respondent has, in the Panel's view, intentionally sought to use the disputed domain name to confuse and attract Internet users seeking the Complainant's business and products to its own website as if it was related to or was so authorised by the Complainant. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name and the website to which it resolves appears to be for its own commercial purposes. This amounts to conduct in terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy which is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <targetdartseu.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alistair Payne/

Alistair Payne

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2026