ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Woodbolt Distribution, LLC v. Ahmad Naasan
Case No. D2026-1770

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Woodbolt Distribution, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Polsinelli PC, United States.

The Respondent is Ahmad Naasan, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <c5extreme.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC. The disputed domain name <c5preworkout.com> is registered with Domain.com - Network Solutions, LLC (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 24, 2026. On April 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 27, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing additional contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 2026, providing the additional registrant and contact information as disclosed by the Registrars.

The Center verified that 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a timely response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 28, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on May 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 company with its registered seat in the United States that engages in the manufacture, marketing, and distribution of inter alia dietary supplements, nutritionals, and beverages. One of the Complainant's product lines is marketed under the widely known brand C4 since at least 2014. Since then, the Complainant's global sales with the popular C4 branded beverages are reaching approximately USD 1 billion a year.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous C4 trademark registrations. The Complainant is, among others, the owner of the United States Trademark Registration No. 4632277, registered on November 4, 2014, and the United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration No. 262728, registered on March 28, 2018, both for C4, covering protection for various goods in class 5.

For many years, the Complainant promoted its C4 branded products at the domain name <c4energy.com>. This domain name is still registered on behalf of the Complainant, but now redirects to a specific product webpage at "cellucor.com/pages/c4-energy".

The Respondent is reportedly located in the United Arab Emirates and has already apparently been involved in some other domain name disputes with the Complainant as a respondent, where the panels have each found bad faith conduct on the part of the Respondent. See *Woodbolt Distribution, LLC v. Ahmad Naasan / C5Energy*, WIPO Case No. DAE2026-0009; *Woodbolt Distribution, LLC v. Ahmad Nassan, Ultramade Nutrition and Beverages (FZE),* WIPO Case No. D2023-4689; *Woodbolt Distribution, LLC v. Ahmad Nasaan, Ultramade Nutrition & Beverages (FZE)*, WIPO Case No. DAE2025-0001. The Parties have also been involved in trademark infringement proceedings before the courts of the United Arab Emirates concerning the Respondent's use of the sign "C5". In a judgment dated December 4, 2024, the Sharjah Federal Court in United Arab Emirates found that the Respondent's use of the sign "C5" in relation to energy drinks infringed the Complainant's C4 trademark. The Respondent's subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Court of Cassation on July 15, 2025.

The disputed domain name <c5extreme.com> was registered on September 26, 2022.

The disputed domain name <c5preworkout.com> was registered on August 13, 2023.

Based on information and screenshots provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name <c5preworkout.com> resolves to a website offering energy drinks prominently using the sign "C5". The drinks offered on that website are designed in a manner similar to those of the Complainant. In particular, they feature a similar overall get-up, including the sign "C5" used in similar stylized and italic lettering as the Complainant's C4 products, combined with a substantially similar packaging design.

The disputed domain name <c5extreme.com> initially redirected to another domain name, that was prominently offering the "C5" branded energy drinks in the same way as mentioned above. However, at the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name <c5extreme.com> no longer resolves to an active website.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, in its email correspondence with the Center on May 28, 2025, the Respondent requested a three member panel and provided various documents. However, the documents provided by the Respondent were referring to another – at that time – pending case at WIPO. Despite a notice rendered by the Center on June 3, 2026, the Respondent neither paid the fee for a three member panel nor provided a response for the present administrative proceeding. In fact, the Center received no further communication from the Respondent.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Aspects

As mentioned above, the Respondent submitted what appeared to be a late response and respective annexes. However, these submissions were not related to the present proceeding, but to a separate WIPO case between the Parties concerning different domain names. Although the Center notified the Respondent of this issue and requested clarification of the Respondent's intended actions in the present proceeding, the Respondent did not do so.

The Panel therefore considers the filed documents by the Respondent as irrelevant to the present proceeding and has disregarded them.

With respect to the Respondent's request for the appointment of a three member panel, the Center notified the Respondent that payment of the applicable fee according to paragraph 5(d) of the Rules was required. The Respondent did not respond to that notification and, in particular, failed to pay the required fee within the prescribed time limit.

Accordingly, the Respondent's request for a three member panel was not given effect, and the Center therefore proceeded with the appointment of a sole panelist in accordance with the Rules.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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 in bad faith.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2007-1228.

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview 3.1 and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

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 the C4 trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the C4 mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. The Panel believes that the substitution of the number "4" of the C4 trademark of the Complainant with the number "5" is a close variant that does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's C4 trademark. Consequently, the Panel finds the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the C4 mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Although the addition of other terms, here "preworkout" respectively "extreme", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such descriptive terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the C4 mark 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.

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 Complainant has credibly submitted that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use a sign confusingly similar to the Complainant's C4 trademark. The disputed domain names have used a close variant of the Complainant's well-known trademark to offer competing goods on webpages with a similar look and feel as the Complainant's branding and online presence. The Complainant's submissions are further supported by the decisions of the Sharjah Federal Court and the

Court of Cassation in the United Arab Emirates, both of which concluded that the Respondent's use of the sign "C5" infringes the Complainant's C4 trademark. The Panel further notes that previous WIPO UDRP panels in disputes between the Parties have reached consistent conclusions. In these circumstances, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests. 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.
Hence, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that, at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names, the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant and its C4 trademark. The disputed domain names each contain the sign "C5", which differs from the Complainant's C4 trademark by a single but similar character. In addition, the Respondent's subsequent use of that sign in a presentation closely imitating the Complainant's trade dress, confirms that the disputed domain names were selected with the Complainant and its C4 trademark in mind. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names were registered with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation associated with the Complainant's C4 trademark. The fact that the disputed domain names were registered long after the Complainant had established rights in its C4 trademark further supports this conclusion.

The Panel further finds that the disputed domain names have been used in bad faith. The associated websites prominently featured, and in the case of the disputed domain name <c5preworkout.com> continue to feature, the sign "C5" for energy drinks in a presentation similar to the Complainant's C4 trademark and overall branding. In view of the Panel, this use by the Respondent creates the false impression that the Respondent and its "C5"-branded products are commercially somehow connected with the Complainant and its popular C4 products.

In the Panel's view, such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By using the disputed domain names in such a manner, the Panel has no doubt that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's C4 trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and of the products offered thereon.

This conclusion is further reinforced by the decisions of the Sharjah Federal Court and the Court of Cassation in the United Arab Emirates, both of which found that the Respondent's use of the sign "C5" infringes the Complainant's C4 trademark.

The fact that the disputed domain name <c5extreme.com> currently does not resolve to an active website does not – given the above-noted circumstances (notably, reputation of the Complainant's C4 trademark, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a formal response) – prevent a finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names 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 names <c5extreme.com> and <c5preworkout.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/
Kaya Köklü
Sole Panelist
Date: July 27, 2026