

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sterling Jewelers Inc. v. 陈军 (Jun Chen)

Case No. D2026-0608

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sterling Jewelers Inc., United States of America, represented by Quarles & Brady LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is 陈军 (Jun Chen), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jared-jewelry.com> is registered with Xiamen 35.Com Information Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 12, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 21, 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 (Registration Private, Registrant for jared-jewelry.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 23, 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 25, 2026.

On February 23, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On February 25, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English 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 February 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Linda Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on March 28, 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, founded in 1910, is a specialty jewelry company and is a subsidiary of Signet Jewelers, one of the world's largest retailers of jewelry with numerous brands. One of the Complainant's jewelry brands is JARED. The Complainant operates more than 200 JARED stores across the United States of America and offers online sales through the website associated with the domain name <jared.com>. The Complainant claims that it has continuously and exclusively used the mark JARED in the marketing and sale of jewelry for over 30 years. The Complainant has received awards and recognition for its JARED branded jewelry and retail services, including "Rising Star" Award in fine jewelry from Fashion Group International in 2024. The Complainant states that the sale revenue from its JARED brand alone was approximately USD 1.1 billion in 2025.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for JARED and JARED THE GALLERIA OF JEWELRY, including:

- United States of America trademark JARED Registration No. 3052726, registered on January 31, 2006, in class 35;
- United States of America trademark JARED Registration No. 3150413, registered on October 3, 2006, in class 14;
- United States of America trademark JARED THE GALLERIA OF JEWELRY Registration No. 1872975, registered on January 10, 1995, in class 42.

The Respondent is based in China. The disputed domain name was registered on April 2, 2023, and resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's JARED and JARED THE GALLERIA OF JEWELRY trademarks and purportedly offering the Complainant's jewelry products.

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 Complainant's JARED trademark in its entirety. The additions of the hyphen "-" and the term "jewelry" in the disputed domain name do not add distinction to the disputed domain name but rather heighten confusion because consumers could relate the term "jewelry" with the goods and retail services provided by the Complainant. Thus, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's JARED trademark;

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the Complainant's trademark in any form. The Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name;

- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name because the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant. The Respondent trades off the goodwill associated with the Complainant and its trademark and misappropriates the Complainant's copyrighted images on the Complainant's website, thereby misleading consumers into believing that the disputed domain name and the associated website are affiliated with the Complainant;

- the Respondent does not meet criteria established in the Oki Data case (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)) for legitimate use by a reseller;

- the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's JARED trademark in its entirety, with the added term "jewelry" that refers to the Complainant's products. This demonstrates the Respondent's deliberate intention to create consumer confusion. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant. By doing so, the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its JARED trademark. In addition, the Respondent's use of privacy service to conceal its identity regarding the disputed domain name is a further indicative of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issues - Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name 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, including the fact that 1) the disputed domain name consists of English words; 2) the content on the website associated with the disputed domain name is in English, which indicate that the Respondent is able to understand English; and 3) using a language other than English as language of the proceeding would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceeding and adjudication of this matter.

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 (see 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.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" as a standard registration requirement should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The entirety of the JARED trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. While the hyphen "-" and the term "jewelry" are included, the JARED trademark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the extra hyphen and term do not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the JARED trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the JARED trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 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 available record shows that:

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the Complainant's JARED trademark in any form;
- there is no evidence proving that the Respondent holds any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name, or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name;

- the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's JARED and JARED THE GALLERIA OF JEWELRY trademarks and purportedly offering the Complainant's jewelry products, without any prominent and accurate explanation of the relationship (or lack thereof) between the Parties. Such use of the disputed domain name indicates the Respondent's intention to divert Internet traffic to the website associated with the disputed domain name by confusing the relationship between the website associated with the disputed domain name and the Complainant, which cannot be deemed as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;

- the nature of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's JARED trademark, together with the hyphen "-" and the term "jewelry" that refers to the Complainant's products, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant; and

- no other factors demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant obtained the trademark registration for JARED as early as January 31, 2006, which significantly predates the registration date of the disputed domain name (April 2, 2023). According to the Complainant's evidence, the Panel accepts that the Complainant and its JARED trademark have gained a certain degree of reputation and recognition in numerous jurisdictions through its extensive use and advertising. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name that fully incorporates the Complainant's JARED trademark and resolves it to a website displaying the Complainant's JARED and JARED THE GALLERIA OF JEWELRY trademarks and purportedly offering the Complainant's jewelry products. The Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and the JARED trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name, and bad faith is found.

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.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's JARED and JARED THE GALLERIA OF JEWELRY trademarks and purportedly offering the Complainant's jewelry products. The Panel holds that by selecting a domain name that fully incorporates and is confusingly similar to the Complainant's JARED trademark, and using it in the manner as described, the Respondent obviously intends to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain name and the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's JARED trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website associated with the disputed domain name, which constitutes bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <jared-jewelry.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Linda Chang/

Linda Chang

Sole Panelist

Date: April 13, 2026