

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cascade Designs, Inc. v. genteq store
Case No. D2026-1520

1. The Parties

Complainant is Cascade Designs, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Baker & Hostetler LLP, United States.

Respondent is genteq store, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <msrofficial.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 April 10, 2026. On April 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 15, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 17, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on May 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on May 21, 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

Complainant is a company organized under the laws of the United States that is active in the outdoor recreation industry.

Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of various trademarks relating to its MSR brand, including, but not limited to, the following:

- word trademark MSR, United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), registration number: 4,996,019, registration date: July 12, 2016, status: active;
- word trademark MSR, USPTO, registration number: 5,155,601, registration date: March 7, 2017, status: active.

Moreover, Complainant has demonstrated to operate an official website at “www.cascadedesigns.com”, used, inter alia, to promote Complainant’s outdoor recreation products under the MSR trademark globally.

Respondent, according to the Registrar verification, is located in China. The disputed domain name was registered on September 22, 2025. By the time of the rendering of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not connect to any active content on the Internet. Complainant, however, has demonstrated that at some point before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website at “www.msrofficial.com”, which pretended to offer outdoor recreation products for online sale, thereby prominently displaying Complainant’s MSR trademark, e.g. on product pictures bearing the MSR official logo, and using former contact information of Complainant.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. Notably, Complainant contends to be a well-known company specializing in outdoor recreation products and that, due to substantial investments, its MSR trademark has developed widespread recognition and valuable goodwill.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s MSR trademark, as it consists of the exact same MSR trademark followed by the word “official”. Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (1) Respondent has no connection to Complainant, and Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or endorsed Respondent’s use of its MSR trademark in the disputed domain name, (2) the website under the disputed domain name does not accurately and prominently disclose any lack of affiliation between the Parties; instead, it impersonates Complainant, and the disputed domain name itself suggests an official source, (3) Respondent’s assertion of copyright ownership over the website content and its use of affiliate links to generate revenue confirm that the disputed domain name is being used as part of Respondent’s own commercial enterprise built around Complainant’s MSR trademark, and (4) Respondent seeks to mislead users into believing that there is an association or affiliation with Complainant by incorporating Complainant’s name, replicating the look and feel of Complainant’s official website on the disputed domain name website, presenting itself as Complainant in its “About Us” section, and listing Complainant’s former Washington

address as its own on the “Contact Us” page. Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since (1) Respondent selected a domain name that pairs Complainant’s MSR trademark with the term “official”, then reinforced the deception by displaying Complainant’s MSR trademark and logo, product imagery, and a false copyright notice which is conduct that cannot plausibly be explained as coincidence, descriptive fair use, or innocent registration, and (2) Respondent seeks to pass itself off as Complainant by using Complainant’s MSR trademark and logo to promote the sale of Complainant’s products through Amazon affiliate links.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

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

Respondent’s default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondent’s failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

First, 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 Complainant’s MSR trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its MSR trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Also, the entirety of such trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, simply added by the term “official”. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s MSR trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (here, the term “official”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, in the Panel’s view, the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant’s MSR trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Second, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

In particular, Respondent has not been authorized to use Complainant's MSR trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondent's name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name, and Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the term "msr" on its own. Quite to the contrary, the disputed domain name, at some point in the past, resolved to a website at "www.msrofficial.com", which was presented as "official" website and pretended to offer outdoor recreation products for online sale, thereby prominently displaying Complainant's MSR trademark, e.g. on product pictures bearing the MSR official logo, and using former contact information of Complainant. Such use of the disputed domain name constitutes a clear impersonation of Complainant, presumably for some unlawful purpose, and, thus, neither qualifies as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. In this context, UDRP panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here Complainant's impersonation/passing off by Respondent) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel, therefore, finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Third, 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 circumstances to this case leave no doubts that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant's rights in its MSR trademark when registering the disputed domain name and that the latter is clearly directed thereto. Moreover, using the disputed domain name to operate a website at "www.msrofficial.com", which pretended to offer outdoor recreation products for online sale, thereby prominently displaying Complainant's MSR trademark, e.g. on product pictures bearing the MSR official logo, and using former contact information of Complainant, without any authorization to do so and creating the impression that such website derives from Complainant which it obviously does not, is a clear indication that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's MSR trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondent's website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Also, UDRP panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, Complainant's impersonation/passing off by Respondent) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel, therefore, finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, too.

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, <msrofficial.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Stephanie G. Hartung/

Stephanie G. Hartung

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2026