

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Coats & Clark Inc. v. Li Siya
Case No. D2026-1053

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Coats & Clark Inc., United States of America, represented by Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is Li Siya, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <getredheart.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 11, 2026. On March 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 14, 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 the Complainant on March 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 March 17, 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 March 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Petra Pecar as the sole panelist in this matter on April 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 Coats & Clark Inc., a company headquartered in the United States of America and operating in the yarn, knitting, sewing, and craft products industry, known for its RED HEART brand dating back to 1936, which today forms part of Spinrite Inc.'s portfolio following its 2019 acquisition of the North American Coats & Clark crafts business.

The Complainant is the owner of registered RED HEART trademarks used in connection with yarn, knitting products, sewing products, and other craft-related goods and services, including:

- Canadian word trademark RED HEART, registration number TMA107361, registered on July 19, 1957, for knitting yarn made of wool or synthetic fibres or mixtures thereof;
- United States of America word trademark RED HEART, registration number 1315907, registered on January 22, 1985, in International Class 26;
- International figurative trademark,  registration number 1350292B, registered on November 8, 2016, in International Classes 23 and 26.

The Complainant, through its affiliated entities, operates official websites, including at <redheart.com>, <yarnspirations.com>, and <spinriteyarns.com>. From at least as early as 2008 until the 2019 acquisition by Spinrite Inc., <redheart.com> was used to host a website and online store for RED HEART branded products. Since the acquisition, <redheart.com> has redirected Internet users to <yarnspirations.com>, where RED HEART branded products are currently advertised and sold online.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 14, 2026 and, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, was used to host a website impersonating the Complainant and redirecting users to “www.amazon.com” search results for “Red Heart yarn”.

The Respondent is a natural person located in 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name, incorporating the RED HEART trademark with the generic term “get”, has been used for fraudulent purposes. The Respondent, who registered the domain name anonymously, allegedly operates a fake “Red Heart” website impersonating the Complainant, displaying its trademarks, logos, product images, and purported RED HEART products. The website provides false contact details, including a misleading physical address, and collects users' personal information through deceptive forms unrelated to the Complainant. According to the Complainant, these activities are intended to mislead consumers, divert Internet traffic, and constitute phishing, thereby harming its business and reputation and demonstrating bad faith registration and use warranting transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the RED HEART trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has no apparent legitimate business connected with it. Rather than making a bona fide offering of goods or services or a fair use, the Respondent allegedly uses the domain name to impersonate the Complainant, divert Internet users to a fake website, exploit the goodwill of the RED HEART brand, and collect users' personal information through a deceptive contact form.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the longstanding reputation of the RED HEART trademark and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a website copying the Complainant's branding, products, and presentation, the Complainant argues that the Respondent must have known of its rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's conduct allegedly shows an intention to attract users by creating a false impression of affiliation, disrupt the Complainant's business, profit from confusion, and facilitate phishing or other fraudulent activity.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Even if the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complainant's contentions, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

"A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable", as indicated in paragraph 15(a) of the Rules.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other term “get” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, it is well accepted practice by UDRP panels that a general Top Level Domain (“gTLD”), such as “.com”, is typically ignored when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark (see section 1.11 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)). For that reason, the Panel accepts not to take into consideration the gTLD “.com” when assessing confusing similarity of the disputed domain name.

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 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.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated with or connected to the Complainant in any manner, nor has the Complainant granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register domain names incorporating the Complainant’s RED HEART trademark. The Respondent holds no prior rights in the RED HEART trademark and has failed to respond to the Complaint, thereby providing no information or evidence that could establish any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Respondent has made any legitimate or bona fide use of the disputed domain name, whether for commercial or noncommercial purposes. Rather, at the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the RED HEART trademark and impersonating the Complainant.

The Complainant has thus established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, which has not been rebutted. The Respondent is neither a licensee nor otherwise authorized to use the RED HEART trademark, and there is no indication that it is commonly known by the “get red heart” name. The website to which the disputed domain name resolves reproduces the Complainant’s RED HEART trademark, thereby creating a false impression of affiliation. Such use cannot be regarded as bona fide or as legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent’s failure to respond to the Complaint further supports the absence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including impersonation/passing off, falsely suggesting an affiliation with a complainant, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. This principle applies in the present case, where the Respondent allegedly used the disputed domain name for a website impersonating the Complainant and displaying the Complainant’s RED HEART trademark.

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name approximately 69 years after the registration of the RED HEART trademark and that the disputed domain name is associated with yarn, knitting, sewing, and craft products.

The disputed domain name incorporates the RED HEART trademark in its entirety together with the additional term “get”. This term is descriptive, as it commonly means to obtain, acquire, or access goods or services. In the Panel’s view, the inclusion of this term does not prevent an association with the Complainant and supports the inference that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name. In the absence of any explanation for the choice of the RED HEART trademark in the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that the registration of the disputed domain name was unlikely to have been coincidental.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the RED HEART trademark and offering yarn, knitting, sewing, and craft products. The overall presentation of the website includes the use of the RED HEART trademark and related product images. In the Panel’s view, such use is likely to create confusion among Internet users as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent did not respond to the Complaint and did not provide any explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, and having regard to all the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including impersonation or passing off, constitutes evidence of bad faith. In the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates the RED HEART trademark and resolves to a website displaying the RED HEART trademark and referring to yarn, knitting, sewing, and craft products, which reinforces the impression of association with the Complainant. Such use is likely to mislead Internet users as to the source or affiliation of the website and therefore constitutes bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under 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 <getredheart.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Petra Pecar/

Petra Pecar

Sole Panelist

Date: April 30, 2026