

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

YKK Europe Limited v. meiqingxiang
Case No. D2025-0601

1. The Parties

The Complainant is YKK Europe Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is meiqingxiang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ykk-europe-collection.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 14, 2025. On February 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 18, 2025, 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 (Respondent Currently Unknown, Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 18, 2025, 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 amendment to the Complaint on February 18, 2025.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 12, 2025.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on March 14, 2025. 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 registered in England and Wales and headquartered in London, England, United Kingdom. It is an operating company within the international YKK Group of over 100 companies, which is a leading manufacturer of zippers and other fasteners as well as architectural products, plastic hardware, and industrial machinery. Many of these products are offered under the sign YKK in more than 70 countries and regions around the world. YKK fasteners are often incorporated into final products such as garments that are manufactured and sold by third parties.

The Complainant operates several “YKK” websites, including a principal website at “www.ykk.com” in Japanese and English, “www.ykkeurope.com” in English, and “www.ykk.cn” in Chinese, each with linked social media sites. The Complainant uses other YKK domain names for “microsites” in connection with marketing campaigns, such as “www.ykkdigitalshowroom.com” and “www.ykklondonshowroom.com”. In the period 2020 to 2023, during the COVID 19 pandemic when in-person trade shows were not being held, the Complainant used the disputed domain name to host a microsite featuring new products and services in lieu of conference events.

The YKK mark derives from the initials of “Yoshida Kōgyō Kabushiki geisha” (Yoshida Manufacturing Company), the Japanese name of the YKK Group from 1945 through 1994. The parent company of the YKK Group, YKK Corporation, a Japanese corporation, holds the trademark registrations for YKK and derivative marks in many countries and regions, including the United Kingdom, such as United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration Number UK00000941376 for the word mark Y K K, registered on April 18, 1969, in International Class 26; Malaysian Trademark Registration Number 5416 for YKK in stylized letters, registered on April 28, 2007, in International Class 26; and China Trademark Registration Number 4822918 for the word mark YKK, registered on January 14, 2009, in International Class 14.

The Registrar reports that the disputed domain name was created on October 15, 2024, and is registered to the Respondent “meiqingxiang”, listing a postal address in China and a Gmail contact email address.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website at the time of this Decision. However, the Complainant reports that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website (the “Respondent’s former website”) displaying pornographic content branded “MDAV” and evidently originating from Malaysia. The Complainant reported the website to law enforcement authorities, who advised the Complainant that some of the content appeared to be illegal and should not be downloaded. The Respondent’s former website can no longer be accessed, and it is not archived on the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine.

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 is confusingly similar to its YKK marks and that the Respondent has no evident rights or legitimate interests in it, using it only for a pornographic website with no connection to the Complainant. The Complainant finds bad faith in the Respondent’s efforts to mask its identity and mislead Internet users for commercial gain, as well as apparently using the disputed domain name for illegal purposes.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark (the registered YKK marks) for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the YKK 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "europe" and "collection") 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 3.0](#), 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 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 3.0](#), 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. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent is known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name (Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii)), or that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a "bona fide" offering of goods or services (paragraph 4(c)(i)). Rather, as discussed in the following section, it appears likely that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith to exploit the Complainant's well-established trademark.

Moreover, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed to be publishing illegal pornographic content, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its distinctive and long-established YKK brand. The disputed domain name itself was formerly (and recently) used by the Complainant. The Respondent's former website had nothing to do with the Complainant or "Europe" and seems merely to have used the Complainant's mark as bait to attract visitors to an unrelated Asian pornography site. This accords with the example of bad faith given in the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv), intentionally attracting Internet users for commercial gain with a domain name that is confusingly similar to a trademark.

Moreover, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed to be publishing illegal pornographic content, as advised by the relevant authorities, also constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds 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 <ykk-europe-collection.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: March 27, 2025