

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Wolters Kluwer Global Brand B.V. v. Ye Fei, Ye Fei
Case No. D2025-1445

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Wolters Kluwer Global Brand B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by Merkenbureau Knijff & Partners B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is Ye Fei, Ye Fei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wolterskuwer.com> is registered with 1API GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 15, 2025. On April 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 15, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 16, 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 amended Complaint on April 17, 2025.

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 April 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on May 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on May 13, 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 part of the global Wolters Kluwer group, a multinational corporation active in information, software, and publishing services across more than 170 countries. The group has operated under the name WOLTERS KLUWER for decades and holds extensive trademark rights worldwide, such as, in particular:

- European Union registration no. 002771129 WOLTERS KLUWER, registered on March 24, 2004 for goods in Classes 9 and 16 and services in Classes 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42 ICGS;
- European Union registration no. 006465611 WOLTERS KLUWER, registered on January 22, 2009 for services in Classes 35, 41 and 44 ICGS; and
- International registration no. 1449907 WOLTERS KLUWER, registered on May 31, 2018 for goods in Classes 09 and 16 and services in Classes 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 44 and 45 ICGS.

The Complainant also uses its main domain name <wolterskluwer.com>, registered on April 25, 1997, to promote its activities.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 11, 2021, and resolves to a parking page which consisted of pay-per-click ("PPC") links.

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:

- (1) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark WOLTERS KLUWER of the Complainant. The similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name is obvious with the only difference being the omission of one letter (the letter "L" in "KLUWER"). The inclusion of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name does not change the conclusion that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks.
- (2) There is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any other indication to that effect. The Complainant also did not authorize the Respondent to use its WOLTERS KLUWER trademark in the disputed domain name. There is no bona fide offerings of goods or services or making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent uses a name that is just one letter different from the well-known name of the Complainant, which is a form of 'typosquatting' and therefore evidence of bad faith. The Respondent likely registered the disputed domain name to divert Internet users to a commercial website that uses a misspelling of the Complainant's trademark WOLTERS KLUWER.
- (3) The Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the trademark WOLTERS KLUWER and the official domain name <wolterskluwer.com> of the Complainant had accrued global name recognition from their use by the Complainant. It is highly likely that the Respondent intends to use the disputed domain name to mislead users, and the active subdomains provided in the Complaint support that interpretation. It is clear from the fame of the WOLTERS KLUWER trademark that the Respondent is aiming to create a likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant asks that the disputed domain name to be transferred.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Respondent contends that:

- (1) The disputed domain name was registered in 2021 and has remained parked since then, displaying only a standard “for sale” notice.
- (2) The Respondent argues that the disputed domain name “kuwer” is orthographically distinct from the Complainant’s KLUWER mark and unlikely to cause confusion. It was acquired and held as part of the Respondent’s lawful domain investment activity, without any intent to target the Complainant or its customers.
- (3) There is no evidence of bad faith registration or use. The Respondent has never contacted the Complainant, created any web content or branding that references the Complainant, or used the disputed domain name for anything other than passive holding.

In light of the above, the Respondent requests that the Complaint be dismissed and that it be allowed to retain ownership of the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as following:

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

The Panel will further analyze the potential concurrence of the above circumstances.

Moreover, the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”) and, where appropriate, will decide consistent 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 mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel confirms that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy the Complainant has satisfied the threshold requirement of having relevant trademark rights for the WOLTERS KLUWER mark, as referenced above.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s WOLTERS KLUWER mark in full, omitting the space between two words and the letter “l” in “kluer”. Such misspelling does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

It is well accepted by UDRP panels that a gTLD, such as “.com”, is typically ignored when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. Therefore, the Panel is of the view that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

For all of the above-mentioned reasons, the Panel concludes that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

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.

As it stands from the available record, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to register the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's mark. The Panel also takes into account that the Respondent is not sponsored by or legitimately affiliated with the Complainant in any way.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or at least has used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or a bona fide offering of goods and services. What is more, parked pages that comprises PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

As such, the Panel finds that the burden of production regarding this element shifts to the Respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the Response, the Respondent has not provided any supporting data or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. While he contends that the disputed domain name was registered as part of a lawful domain investment activity and has remained passively held with a “for sale” notice, such assertions alone, without further substantiation, such as evidence of preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, are insufficient to establish rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

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.

As it stands from the case file, and also found by other panels, the WOLTERS KLUWER trademark is known throughout the world as a result of extensive use and advertising creating an exclusive connection between the WOLTERS KLUWER mark and the Complainant. Thus, it is the view of the Panel that the Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant and its trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

In addition, the Respondent's misspelling of the Complainant's WOLTERS KLUWER mark in the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent is typosquatting, which is a further indication of bad faith registration and use pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

In the Response, the Respondent claims there is no evidence of bad faith registration or use, noting that he has never contacted the Complainant, created content referring to the Complainant, or used the disputed domain name for anything beyond passive holding. However, the evidence on record shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a PPC website containing advertising links, which may include links targeting the Complainant or its area of commercial activity. The use of a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known mark for monetized PPC advertising may, in appropriate circumstances, constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, especially when there is no plausible explanation or legitimate use offered by the Respondent. Due to the fame of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel considers that it is likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation. The Panel, therefore, is of the view that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith and that the Complainant has established its case under paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <wolterskuwer.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/

Ganna Prokhorova

Sole Panelist

Date: May 27, 2025