ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Electrolux Consumer Products, Inc. v. 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.)
Case No. D2026-3884

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Electrolux Consumer Products, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Corsearch, Inc., the United States.

The Respondent is 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kitchenfrigidaire.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Xin Net Technology Corp. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 31, 2026. On August 31, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 2, 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 September 4, 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 September 9, 2026.

On September 4, 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 September 9, 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 September 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Rosita Li as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 is an American company and major subsidiary and operating entity of the global Electrolux Group. The Complainant manufactures and distributes household and kitchen appliances such as refrigerators, washers, dryers, and dishwashers under the brand names such as ELECTROLUX and FRIGIDAIRE. Today, the Complainant's products can be found in over 120 markets. The FRIGIDAIRE brand dates back to 1918, and was acquired by the AB Electrolux group in 1986.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for FRIGIDAIRE in various jurisdictions, including:

1. United States Trade Mark No. 364709 for FRIGIDAIRE (stylized), registered in Class 21 on February 14, 1939;
2. United States Trade Mark No. 502399 for FRIGIDAIRE (stylized), registered in Class 24 on September 21, 1948;
3. United States Trade Mark No. 616196 for FRIGIDAIRE, registered in Class 31 on November 15, 1955;
4. United States Trade Mark No. 1039192 for FRIGIDAIRE, registered in Class 11 on May 11, 1976;
5. United States Trade Mark No. 1039142 for FRIGIDAIRE, registered in Class 7 on May 11, 1976; and
6. European Union Trade Mark No. 000071241 for FRIGIDAIRE, registered in Classes 7 and 11 on December 13, 1999.

(collectively, the "FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks").

The Complainant is also the owner of a domain name that comprises the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks, namely <frigidaire.com>. The said domain name resolves to the Complainant's website that offers FRIGIDAIRE products for sale (the "Complainant's Website").

At the time of the Complaint, , the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website that displayed the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks and purported to offer FRIGIDAIRE products for sale (the "Respondent's Website"), effectively copying the Complainant's Website. The Respondent's Website is not accessible at the time of preparing this Decision.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered by the Respondent on August 28, 2025.

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.

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The Complainant contends that:

- The Complainant is the owner of the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks.

- Only the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name is relevant when assessing identity or confusing similarity with the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks; the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") (e.g. ".com") is disregarded.
- The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks, with the prefix "kitchen" and the ".com" gTLD, neither of which is sufficient to distinguish the Disputed Domain Name from the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks.
- The Respondent's Website resembled or appeared to be affiliated with the Complainant's Website, further evidencing an intent to confuse users.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant contends that:

- The Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, and there is no evidence that it held trademarks or other intellectual property rights in either name when registering them.
- The Complainant is not affiliated with the Respondent and has neither licensed the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks nor authorized the Respondent to use the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks in any domain name or otherwise.
- The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name does not constitute a bona fide or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, as the Respondent's Website implied an affiliation with the Complainant by prominently displaying the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks in the Disputed Domain Name and on the Respondent's Website, which purported to sell FRIGIDAIRE refrigerators and other kitchen appliances at discounts of up to 45%.
- The Respondent's Website also copied content from the Complainant's official channels and purports to sell products bearing the Complainant's marks and images, creating a false affiliation that misled customers into believing the Respondent's Website was operated or authorized by the Complainant and that the Respondent's goods were authentic.
- The Respondent fails to satisfy the "Oki Data test", as the website does not accurately and prominently disclose its lack of affiliation with the Complainant.
- The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on August 28, 2025, long after the Complainant registered the FRIGIDAIRE Trademark of United States Trade Mark No. 364709 for FRIGIDAIRE (stylized) on February 14, 1939 and <frigidaire.com> on January 19, 1995.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that:

- The Respondent is intentionally attracting Internet users to the Respondent's Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks for commercial gain from the sale of kitchen appliances or personal data obtained on the Respondent's Website, despite having no licence or other right to sell the FRIGIDAIRE products.
- The Respondent is diverting Internet customers from the Complainant's Website to the Respondent's Website through confusion caused by the similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks, thus disrupting the Complainant's business. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent purportedly sells the Complainant's products or instead conducts phishing activities to collect customers' personal data.
- There are numerous adverse UDRP decisions against the Respondent, which demonstrates a pattern of cybersquatting and bad faith. The prior decisions include: *Senoret Chemical Company v. 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.),* WIPO Case No. D2026-2822; *NIC Industries, Inc v. 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.),* WIPO Case No. D2026-2341; *Airxcel, Inc. v. 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.),* WIPO Case No. D2026-2046; and *FS IP Owner LLC v. 杨勇波 (yongbo), 博思云科技（浙江）有限公司 (Boss Cloud Technology (Zhejiang) Co., Ltd.),* WIPO Case No. D2026-1766 (collectively, the "Prior Decisions").
- The Complainant's worldwide reputation, the incorporation of the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks in the Disputed Domain Name, and the offering of FRIGIDAIRE products on the Respondent's Website demonstrate the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant and the FRIGIDAIRE Marks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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:

- The Respondent used an English term "kitchen" in the Disputed Domain Name.
- The Respondent's Website exclusively conducted business in English.
- Being a United States entity, if the Complainant had to translate the Complaint and supporting exhibits into Chinese, this would entail a great deal of additional expenses and delay in the proceedings.
- The language of the Registration Agreements in the Prior Decisions was also Chinese, yet the panels in those decisions adopted English as the language of proceedings under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

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.

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.

Based on the available materials, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. The addition of the term "kitchen" would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under this first element. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.8.

Based on the available materials, 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 the 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.

In accordance with WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1, where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the Second- or Top-Level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The Disputed Domain Name has included the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks in their entirety, plus the descriptive term "kitchen", which would easily be understood as referring to the Complainant's FRIGIDAIRE brand and appliances. Thus, the Disputed Domain Name is likely to be interpreted by Internet users as indicating some form of relationship or association with the Complainant.

In accordance with WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.2, panels will assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case support a claimed fair use, including the following:

- whether the domain name registration and use by the respondent is consistent with a broader pattern of bona fide activity (whether online or offline) and not to take advantage of a complainant's mark in a bad faith or abusive way;
- whether it is clear to Internet users visiting the respondent's website that it is not operated by the complainant especially where this is readily apparent from the site look-and-feel and content (which may include the use of a reasonably clear and prominent/visible disclaimer); and
- whether a prominent link (including with explanatory text) is provided to the relevant trademark owner's website.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent's Website does not appear to be a bona fide offering of goods or services, but instead appears to have taken advantage of the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks in bad faith, as the Respondent's website is a copycat website of the Complainant's Website. The Panel not

- The Respondent's Website featured the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks;
- The Respondent's Website displayed and offered for sale, a number of products purportedly manufactured by the Complainant at a discounted price bearing the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks; and
- The Respondent's Website copied elements and content from the Complainant's Website, thereby creating a false association with the Complainant, and purported to offer products using the Complainant's marks and images.

The Panel finds that the Respondent appears to be intentionally misleading consumers into believing that the Disputed Domain Name and the Respondent's Website are owned or operated by the Complainant or are otherwise linked in some manner to the Complainant in order to trade on the fame and goodwill of the Complainant for the Respondent's own commercial gain.

Given the above, the Panel finds that there is a risk that the public would assume that the Disputed Domain Name is authorized by or affiliated with the Complainant. It is clear that the use of the Disputed Domain Name and operation of the Respondent's Website are an attempt by the Respondent to capitalize on the

goodwill and reputation of the Complainant and its FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks. The Panel does not consider this to be a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name nor a bona fide offering of goods or services.

For completeness, the Panel accepts that the Respondent has failed to meet the "Oki Data Test" in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8.1. There is no disclosure of the Respondent's relationship (or rather, the lack of relationship) with the Complainant on the Respondent's Website.

Further, the Panel notes that the word "frigidaire" is a dictionary word in French for a refrigerator. However, this does not assist the Respondent, as merely registering a domain name comprised of a dictionary word would not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. For the reasons set out above, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is being used in a way that trades off the FRIGIDAIRE Trademark and there are indications that the Respondent is targeting the Complainant, which would undermine any claim to a right or legitimate interest. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.10.

Finally, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (here, claimed copycat site or passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Based on the available materials, 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 Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks in their entirety. The Panel also notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 28, 2025, well after the registration of the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks and <frigidaire.com>. The Panel is satisfied that the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks were established and enjoyed a strong reputation through the Complainant's longstanding and substantial use in relation to household and kitchen appliances. The Panel is prepared to find that the Respondent knew or should have known that the registration of the Disputed Domain Name would be confusingly similar to the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks, which is also supported by the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name, which is confusingly similar to the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks, is a clear indication of bad faith.

In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the circumstances indicate that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Website and its FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks, in particular, in relation to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, endorsement of the Respondent's Website and of the products featured on the Respondent's Website.

The Disputed Domain Name resolved to the Respondent's Website, which until recently prominently and repeatedly displayed a logo identical to a stylized version of the FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks that can be found on the Complainant's Website, used the Complainant's copyrighted images without authorization, and referred to the Complainant's products, trademarks and business activities. The Panel finds that the Respondent's Website appears to have mimicked the Complainant's Website. This circumstance demonstrates no conceivable good faith use. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

Although the Respondent's Website recently became inaccessible, this does not preclude a bad faith finding in this case noting the prior use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Further, based on the Panel's review of the Prior Decisions, the Respondent appears to have engaged in a pattern of registering domain names corresponding to the distinct marks of other brand owners – a clear pattern of being a cybersquatter and indicator of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2. Similarly, the Respondent did not submit any Response in those proceedings, and the panels in all the Prior Decisions ordered that those disputed domain names be transferred to the respective complainants. This suggests a pattern of abusive registrations and adds to the Panel's conclusion of bad faith.

By reason of the matters stated above, and with no response from the Respondent, the Panel is prepared to find the Respondent's aim in registering and using the Disputed Domain Name was to target, profit from, and exploit the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant and its FRIGIDAIRE Trademarks.

Further, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (here, claimed copycat site or passing off) constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes 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 <kitchenfrigidaire.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rosita Li/
Rosita Li
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026