

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

HNI Technologies Inc. v. keren Argaman

Case No. D2026-1825

1. The Parties

The Complainant is HNI Technologies Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, United States.

The Respondent is keren Argaman, United States, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain names <heatilatorfireplacerepair.com>, <heatilatorfireplaceservice.com>, <heatnglofireplacerepair.com>, <heatnglofireplaceservice.com>, <majesticfireplacerepair.com>, <majesticstoverepair.com>, <majesticstoveservice.com>, <monessenfireplacerepair.com>, <monessenfireplaceservice.com>, <quadrafirefireplacerepair.com>, <quadrafirefireplaceservice.com>, <quadrafirestoverepair.com>, <quadrafirestoveservice.com>, <simplifirefireplacerepair.com>, <simplifirefireplaceservice.com>, <vermontcastingsfireplacerepair.com>, <vermontcastingsfireplaceservice.com>, <vermontcastingsstoverepair.com>, and <vermontcastingsstoveservice.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 28, 2026. On April 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 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 Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 1, 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 May 6, 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 May 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 9, 2026. On the same date, the Respondent sent an informal communication to the Center, expressing a desire to explore an amicable resolution and that it was reaching out to the Complainant's counsel regarding settlement. In the same correspondence, the Respondent indicated an interest in the proceedings being suspended. The following day, counsel for the Complainant sent an email to the Center confirming that it had begun correspondence with the Respondent but that it preferred the proceedings not be suspended.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on June 15, 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 and its related companies, including Hearth & Home Technologies LLC, are in the furniture industry. Through one of its divisions, it provides fireplace, stove, and hearth related products. The Complainant or one of its subsidiaries own a number of marks that are used in connection with these products, and enjoy the benefits of registration of those marks in a number of jurisdictions. Among these registrations are the following United States registrations (hereafter referred to as the "Complainant's marks"):

MARK	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE
HEAT & GLO	2,305,307	January 4, 2000
HEATILATOR	1,135,068	May 13, 1980
MAJESTIC	3,771,348	April 6, 2010
MONESSEN	3,770,599	April 6, 2010
QUADRA-FIRE	2,865,930	July 27, 2004
SIMPLIFIRE	4,361,500	July 2, 2013
VERMONT CASTINGS	1,252,241	September 27, 1983

According to the Whois information, the disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

<heatilatorfireplacerepair.com>	February 16, 2026
<heatilatorfireplaceservice.com>	February 16, 2026
<heatnglofireplacerepair.com>	February 16, 2026
<heatnglofireplaceservice.com>	February 16, 2026
<majesticfireplacerepair.com>	February 16, 2026
<majesticstoverepair.com>	February 17, 2026
<majesticstoveservice.com>	February 17, 2026
<monessenfireplacerepair.com>	February 16, 2026
<monessenfireplaceservice.com>	February 16, 2026
<quadrafirefireplacerepair.com>	February 16, 2026
<quadrafirefireplaceservice.com>	February 16, 2026
<quadrafirestoverepair.com>	February 17, 2026
<quadrafirestoveservice.com>	February 17, 2026
<simplifirefireplacerepair.com>	February 16, 2026
<simplifirefireplaceservice.com>	February 16, 2026
<vermontcastingsfireplacerepair.com>	February 16, 2026
<vermontcastingsfireplaceservice.com>	February 16, 2026
<vermontcastingsstoverepair.com>	February 17, 2026
<vermontcastingsstoveservice.com>	February 17, 2026

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has used certain of the disputed domain names to direct Internet traffic to websites that purport to sell fireplace repair and maintenance services, making unauthorized use of the Complainant's marks. As for other of the disputed domain names, the Complainant asserts they direct to parked webpages and that the Respondent has configured MX records, enabling the Respondent to send and receive email messages with addresses associated with these disputed domain names.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally respond to the Complainant's contentions but, as noted in Section 3 above, sent an informal communication to the Center on June 9, 2026.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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 in bad faith. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7. 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. *Id.* This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to those marks.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in multiple marks – each of which are contained within the disputed domain names – through trademark registrations dating back to 1980, including registrations for the marks HEATILATOR, MAJESTIC, MONESSEN, QUADRA-FIRE, SIMPLIFIRE, and VERMONT CASTINGS. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's marks in their entirety, accompanied by descriptive terms such as "fireplace," "stove," "repair," and "service." In the case of the HEAT & GLO mark, it is contained within two of the disputed domain names but replacing "&" with the letter "n". This minor change does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's HEAT & GLO mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The Complainant's marks remain readily recognizable and prominent in each of the disputed domain names, supporting a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy.

It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant's trademarks to not take the extension into account. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at 1.11.1 ("The applicable Top Level Domain ('TLD') in a domain name (e.g., '.com', '.club', '.nyc') is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.").

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Respondent has not become commonly known by any of the disputed domain names, (2) the Respondent is not authorized by Complainant to use its marks, (3) the Respondent has used privacy-shielding services to conceal its identity, and (4) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent has used certain of the disputed domain names to direct Internet traffic to websites that purport to sell fireplace repair and maintenance services while impersonating or creating false associations with Complainant, and the Respondent has configured other disputed domain names with MX servers to facilitate email activity, all while soliciting personal information from Internet users under misleading circumstances.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this prima facie showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent's favor. The use of domain names for illegal activity such as impersonation, passing off, or phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. *Société des Produits Nestlé S.A. v. Great Homes, jobs-nestle.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2911](#); [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Policy describes several non-exhaustive circumstances demonstrating a respondent's bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant's marks have been registered for decades, with some dating back to 1980, and the Complainant has maintained an extensive online presence promoting these marks for many years prior to Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names. Through such longstanding use and visibility, the Complainant's marks became distinctive and recognizable to consumers before the Respondent registered the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the Respondent most likely knew of the Complainant's marks at the time of registration.

The circumstances surrounding the registrations of the disputed domain names further demonstrate bad faith. The Respondent registered nineteen disputed domain names on February 16-17, 2026, all incorporating the Complainant's distinctive marks. Such bulk registration of multiple domain names incorporating several well-known marks owned by a single entity, combined with the Respondent's use of privacy-shielding services to conceal its identity, demonstrates bad faith at the time of registration. There is

no plausible legitimate reason why the Respondent would register this volume of confusingly similar domain names and then conceal its identity.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names further demonstrates bad faith registration and use. Under Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv), evidence of bad faith use is shown when a domain name is registered to utilize another's well-known trademark for attracting Internet users to a website for commercial gain.

The Respondent has used certain of the disputed domain names to direct Internet traffic to websites purporting to offer fireplace repair and maintenance services. These websites solicit personal information from Internet users, including names, telephone numbers, and email addresses, under misleading circumstances. Two of these websites prominently feature variations of the Complainant's marks in their headers (HEAT & GLO displayed as "Heat N Glo" and QUADRA-FIRE displayed as "Quadra Fire"), with only minor alterations that do not meaningfully distinguish the marks. These modifications reinforce the misleading impression of affiliation with the Complainant and demonstrate an intentional attempt to attract Internet users to the disputed domain names for commercial gain in bad faith. See *Eli Lilly and Company v. Shoaib Manzoor, XMart Host, Zain Ali and Rauf Bhatti*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3674](#); *Eli Lilly and Company v. Priscila Santana*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4480](#).

The Respondent's use of the inactive disputed domain names compounds this evidence of bad faith. The Respondent has configured these domain names with MX servers to facilitate email activity despite the domain names being otherwise devoid of content. Prior panels have found that such activity "tends to indicate Respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain name is to use it in a fraudulent scam, for example to lure consumers into believing they are being contacted by Complainant." See *AdvanSix Resins & Chemicals LLC v. ZOP LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4072](#). The configured MX servers create a likelihood that the disputed domain names might be used for sending emails. Moreover, the creation of impersonating and misleading websites suggesting a connection to the Complainant and seeking sensitive personal information is an indication of bad faith. See *Arcelormittal SA v. Bienvenu Bikoumou*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2253](#); [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Under Policy Paragraph 4(b)(ii), registration of domain names to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name is indicative of bad faith registration and use, provided the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct. The Respondent has registered nineteen disputed domain names containing the Complainant's marks. This pattern of registering multiple domain names containing the Complainant's trademarks for commercial gain is evidence that the Respondent engaged in opportunistic bad faith conduct. See *Salvatore Ferragamo S.p.A. v. Ying Chou*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-2034](#).

The totality of the circumstances, namely, the bulk registration of the disputed domain names incorporating multiple established marks, the concealment of identity, the impersonation and minor alterations of the marks, the solicitation of personal information under misleading circumstances, and the configuration of MX servers for email activity to inherently misleading domain names, all demonstrate that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 following disputed domain names <heatilatorfireplacerepair.com>, <heatilatorfireplaceservice.com>, <heatnglofireplacerepair.com>, <heatnglofireplaceservice.com>, <majesticfireplacerepair.com>, <majesticstoverepair.com>, <majesticstoveservice.com>, <monessenfireplacerepair.com>, <monessenfireplaceservice.com>, <quadrafirefireplacerepair.com>, <quadrafirefireplaceservice.com>, <quadrafirestoverepair.com>, <quadrafirestoveservice.com>, <simplifirefireplacerepair.com>, <simplifirefireplaceservice.com>, <vermontcastingsfireplacerepair.com>,

<vermontcastingsfireplaceservice.com>, <vermontcastingsstoverepair.com> and <vermontcastingsstoveservice.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: June 29, 2026