

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TTS Tooltechnic Systems AG & Co. v. Miss Clela Lockman, III
Case No. D2025-1685

1. The Parties

The Complainant is TTS Tooltechnic Systems AG & Co., Germany, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Miss Clela Lockman, III, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <festoolz.shop> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 25, 2025. On April 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 29, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 30, 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 30, 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 May 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on June 6, 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 the holding company of Festool GmbH, a leading German manufacturer of high-quality power tools and accessories founded in 1925.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in various jurisdictions, including the International trademark FESTOOL (Reg. No. 719870, registered on July 3, 1999).

The Complainant promotes its products via its website “www.festool.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 9, 2025. The website associated with the disputed domain name is purportedly offering the Complainant’s products and using images taken from the Complainant’s own website.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has not submitted any 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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

A domain name is “identical or confusingly similar” to a trademark for the purposes of the Policy when the domain name includes the trademark, or a confusingly similar approximation, regardless of other terms in the domain name (*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#)). The Complainant’s trademark is recognizable 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. The addition of the letter “z” to the Complainant’s FESTOOL trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Panel finds that 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 that 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 evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds that 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.

The disputed domain name constitutes a misspelling of the Complainant’s prior registered FESTOOL trademark by adding the letter “z”. The difference between the two is rather subtle. Therefore, under the circumstances of this case, it is more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name and was engaged in an attempt to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name may be associated with the Complainant.

The evidence and allegations submitted by the Complainant support a finding that the Respondent was engaged in an attempt to attract Internet users to its website for its own commercial gain. The Respondent therefore used the disputed domain name in bad faith in accordance with the paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <festoolz.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Zuberbühler/

Tobias Zuberbühler

Sole Panelist

Date: June 20, 2025