

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Euomarket Designs, Inc. d/b/a Crate & Barrel v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)  
Case No. D2026-0592

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Euomarket Designs, Inc. d/b/a Crate & Barrel, United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren), China.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <crateandbarrel.life> and <crateandbarrel.live> are registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd.; and the disputed domain names <crateandbarrel.online>, <crateandbarrel.site>, <crateandbarrel.space>, <crateandbarrel.tech>, and <crateandbarrel.website> are registered with West263 International Limited (the “Registrars”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 12, 2026. On February 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 24, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 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 in English on February 27, 2026.

On February 24, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On February 27, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Qiang Ma as the sole panelist in this matter on April 13, 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 global company with more than 100 store locations in nine countries across three continents. The Complainant has 89 store locations and eight outlets across the United States and Canada, offering a wide range of unique home furnishings and home decor items. In addition, the Complainant has a number of outlet locations and publishes a print catalogue, one of the best in the industry, which reaches millions of its customers worldwide. The Complainant also maintains a globally accessible online retail platform through its website “www.crateandbarrel.com”, through which it offers international sales and shipping services.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of trademark registrations for CRATE & BARREL and CRATE AND BARREL, including but not limited to the Chinese Trademark CRATE & BARREL, registered on March 21, 2002 and designated for International Class 35 (Chinese Trademark Registration Number 1735396), the Chinese Trademark CRATE & BARREL, registered on November 21, 2016 and designated for International Class 21 (Chinese Trademark Registration Number 15907999), and the United States Trademark CRATE AND BARREL, registered on December 15, 1987 and designated for International Class 42 (US Trademark Registration Number 1469515).

The Respondent is 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren), based in China.

The disputed domain names were registered on June 30, 2025. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain names redirect Internet users to a third-party website, where they are being offered for sale for USD 1,450 each. The current use of the disputed domain names remains consistent with the Complainant’s evidence.

#### **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names wholly incorporate the Complainant’s CRATE AND BARREL trademarks in their entirety with only the omission of spaces, and that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) should be disregarded, thereby rendering the disputed domain names identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks.

Moreover, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Specifically, the Respondent is neither authorized by the Complainant nor commonly known by the disputed domain

names, and has made no bona fide or legitimate use thereof. Instead, the disputed domain names are offered for sale at a price exceeding the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs. Additionally, the Respondent registered the disputed domain names significantly later than the Complainant's long-established CRATE AND BARREL / CRATE & BARREL trademarks and the Complainant's primary domain name <crateandbarrel.com>.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith because the Complainant's trademarks are highly distinctive and well known, making it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of them at the time of registration. It further submits that the Respondent received actual notice through the Trademark Clearinghouse, has engaged in a pattern of cybersquatting reflected in multiple similar registrations and prior UDRP cases (e.g., *Proctor.io Incorporated v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4566](#) and *Navantia S.A. v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2830](#)), and is seeking to profit by selling the disputed domain names at inflated prices. In addition, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent's failure to respond to cease-and-desist letters is further evidence of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons. Firstly, the Complainant is unable to communicate in Chinese, and requiring a full translation of the Complaint would impose an undue financial and administrative burden, leading to unnecessary delay. Secondly, the disputed domain names are composed of Latin characters and incorporate the Complainant's CRATE AND BARREL trademark, which has no specific meaning in Chinese. Thirdly, the evidence shows that the websites associated with the disputed domain names has been used to redirect users to a third-party English-language website. This suggests that the Respondent is familiar with the English language. Finally, The Respondent failed to respond to previous cease-and-desist letters sent in English and has chosen not to participate in this administrative proceeding. By not objecting to the Complainant's request or expressing a preference for Chinese, the Respondent has not demonstrated that conducting the proceeding in English would cause any prejudice.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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

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

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. The Second-Level Domain of the disputed domain names consists solely of the Complainant's CRATE AND BARREL trademark minus the spaces between the terms.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although gTLD extensions (".online", ".site", ".space", ".tech", ".life", ".live", and ".website") are added to the disputed domain names, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, these gTLDs may be disregarded in the comparison between the disputed domain names and the mark. Accordingly, gTLDs are disregarded for the present purpose. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

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.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Firstly, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain names or by a similar name. The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use or register any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark. To date, the Respondent has not acquired or applied for any trademark registrations for CRATE & BARREL or CRATE AND BARREL. Moreover, the Complainant has never authorized or permitted the Respondent to register the disputed domain names. Therefore, it can reasonably be concluded that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Secondly, the Respondent does not appear to be making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or tarnish the Complainant's trademarks. In this case, the disputed domain names are being offered for sale for USD

1,450 each, indicating that the Respondent's primary intent is for commercial gain. Such use does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain names are being used solely for the purpose of sale.

None of the circumstances in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy are present in this case. For these reasons, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Based on the available record, 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.

Firstly, the Panel notes that the reputation of the Complainant's trademark CRATE AND BARREL in the field of home furnishings and home decor items is clearly established, and the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant, and deliberately registered the disputed domain names in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Secondly, the disputed domain names wholly incorporate the Complainant's trademark and are almost identical to the Complainant's primary domain name <crateandbarrel.com>, which further increases the likelihood of confusion. The Respondent has used the disputed domain names to redirect Internet users to a third-party website where they are being offered for sale, demonstrating an intention to sell or otherwise transfer the domain name registration to the Complainant to a competitor of the Complainant, most likely for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain names, which constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the Respondent has registered seven disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant's CRATE AND BARREL mark, which in itself demonstrates multiple instances of abusive registration targeting the same trademark. In addition, the Respondent has been involved in a significant number of prior UDRP proceedings, many of which resulted in adverse findings against the Respondent, further evidencing a pattern of cybersquatting conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

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 names <crateandbarrel.life>, <crateandbarrel.live>, <crateandbarrel.online>, <crateandbarrel.site>, <crateandbarrel.space>, <crateandbarrel.tech>, and <crateandbarrel.website> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Qiang Ma/*

**Qiang Ma**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 30, 2026