

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Red Lion Controls Inc. v. Magnum Domains
Case No. D2025-1545

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Red Lion Controls Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Magnum Domains, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <entron.org> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 16, 2025. On April 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 16, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that 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 22, 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 April 22, 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 April 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Steven Auvil as the sole panelist in this matter on May 29, 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

According to the Complaint the Complainant is a United States-based global industrial data company that develops and manufactures innovative products and solutions to access, connect, and visualize information. The Complainant has offices across the United States, Asia-Pacific, and Europe.

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks for its N-TRON brand including Canadian registration No. TMA736162 for N-TRON, registered March 11, 2009, European Union registration No. 006193502 for N-TRON, registered on September 29, 2008, Australian registration No. 1217229 for N-TRON, registered August 10, 2007, United States registration No. 2869885 for N-TRON, registered on August 3, 2004, and International registration No. 945546 for N-TRON, registered on August 10, 2007.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 24, 2024. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a page issuing a malware warning. At the time of writing this Decision, the disputed domain name resolved to a website indicating that the disputed domain name is available for sale.

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.

The Complainant first contends that the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's N-TRON mark with a misspelling, adding the letter "e" at the beginning of the Complainant's N-TRON mark, known as typosquatting, and is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant next alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Complainant given the Respondent any permission to register the Complainant's N-TRON mark in a domain name or otherwise. Additionally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent is not making any legitimate use of the disputed domain name.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complaint contends that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's business when it registered the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name was registered to create confusion between the Respondent and the Complainant to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users. The Complainant further alleges it filed an abuse report against the Respondent for the registration of the disputed domain name using the Registrar's abuse report form, and the Complainant also sent the abuse report to the Respondent via the Registrar. Thereafter, according to the Complainant, the Respondent proposed to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for USD 2888, evidencing the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also sent the Respondent a cease-and-desist letter that the Respondent failed to respond to.

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

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following to obtain relief:

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

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel is entitled to accept as true the allegations set forth in the Complaint (unless the evidence is clearly contradictory), and to derive reasonable inferences from the evidence presented. See *Talk City, Inc. v. Michael Robertson*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0009](#).

Based on the foregoing guidance, the Panel makes the following findings and conclusions based on the allegations and evidence contained in the Complaint, as amended, and reasonable inferences drawn from the evidence presented.

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.

Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms, whether descriptive or otherwise, will not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Additionally, as set forth in section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") (e.g., ".com", ".site", ".info", ".shop") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element's confusing similarity test. As such, the use of ".org" gTLD in the disputed domain name has no bearing on the confusing similarity analysis.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy as the Complainant owns at least one trademark for N-TRON. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. While the Complainant has put forth minimal contentions of how the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's N-TRON mark, they are confusingly similar. Both the mark and the disputed domain name include the letters "tron" and this represents a significant if not dominant portion of both the N-TRON mark and the disputed domain name. Moreover, "en" and "N" portions of the disputed domain name and mark are phonetically the same. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. 陈智佳 (chen zhi jia)*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2150](#). The presence of a "-" in the N-TRON mark, in the Panel's view, does not obviate confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the N-TRON mark.

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. Such circumstances include:

- (i) before any notice of the dispute, the respondent used, or prepared to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- (ii) the respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) is commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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 the production of information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. Considering this difficulty, 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. Nothing in the record suggests that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Indeed, there is no evidence that any of the circumstances listed in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy apply. Moreover, the Respondent has not come forward with relevant evidence to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie showing of the absence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the dispute domain name.

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, that shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith if found by the Panel to be present.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of circumstances that suggest 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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

First, the Respondent likely copied the Complainant’s well-known N-TRON mark and included it in the disputed domain name, resulting in confusing similarity and a risk of implied affiliation. This supports a finding of registration in bad faith.

Second, the evidence demonstrates that after the Complainant submitted a Registrar abuse report and forwarded supporting documents to the Respondent via the Registrar, the Respondent sought to extract a relatively large sum from the Complainant in exchange for transferring the disputed domain name. Under

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1, “bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant’s mark [...] UDRP paragraph 4(b) provides that any one of the following non-exclusive scenarios constitutes evidence of a respondent’s bad faith: (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name [...]” This is exactly what the Respondent has attempted to do, having solicited USD 2888 from the Complainant for the disputed domain name – an amount likely far in excess of the cost to procure the disputed domain name. See *Bharti Airtel Limited v. Nyasa Hub, NyasaHub.com / Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2589](#).

Third, the disputed domain name current resolves to a page displaying a general offer to sell the disputed domain name. At no time did the Respondent use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or service. This fact coupled with the fact the Respondent attempted to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant at a price purportedly above its out-of-pockets costs shows bad faith registration and use. See *JCDECAUX SA. v. Scott Bailey*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3476](#).

Moreover, the Panel notes that the Respondent has not participated in this proceeding and there is nothing in the record pointing to good faith registration or use.

The Panel therefore 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 <entron.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven Auvil/

Steven Auvil

Sole Panelist

Date: June 12, 2025