

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LKQ Corporation v. steven parker, wowsautospareparts.llc  
Case No. D2025-1873

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is LKQ Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Irwin IP LLP, United States.

The Respondent is steven parker, wowsautospareparts.llc, India.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <onestopstoutionlkq.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 9, 2025. On May 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 12, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 13, 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 May 16, 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 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Delia-Mihaela Belciu as the sole panelist in this matter on June 17, 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 based in the United States and is a provider of alternative and specialty parts to repair and accessorize automobiles and other vehicles. It purchases over 600,000 used cars and trucks each year and repurposes those used cars and trucks to provide affordable, high-quality recycled OEM auto parts. The Complainant also provides for sale aftermarket replacement parts, which are newly manufactured parts designed to replace damaged or worn original equipment parts in order to return a vehicle to its original condition and appearance, as the vast majority of vehicle owners seeking to repair their vehicles desire them be returned to their original condition and appearance in the event they have been damaged or otherwise become worn.

The Complainant currently operates in more than 25 countries worldwide and uses an LKQ name and mark in not only the United States, but also Canada, India, and the United Kingdom, among others. The Complainant employs more than 51,000 employees at its 1,700 locations worldwide.

The Complainant has been featured on the television show "EARTH with John Holden," a program that showcases companies helping preserve the planet through eco-friendly initiatives.

The Complainant is in particular the owner of the following LKQ trademark registrations:

- the United State trademark registration No. 4221221 for LKQ, registered on October 9, 2012, for services in class 35;
- the United State trademark registration No. 3589998 for LKQ CORPORATION, registered on March 17, 2009, for services in class 35.

The Complainant also owns the United States trademark registration No. 3064565 for LKQ, registered on February 28, 2006, on the supplemental register, for services in class 35.

In addition, the Complainant is the registrant of the domain name <lkqcorp.com> since April 24, 1998, which corresponds to its corporate website.

The disputed domain name <onestopstoutionlkq.com> was registered on February 1, 2025, and previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's LKQ mark and logo and purportedly selling vehicle parts. Following orders from this website, fake invoices containing the Complainant's LKQ mark and logo were sent to actual customers, who thought they were dealing with the Complainant, along with payment instructions from an email address containing the LKQ mark, under the LKQ name, to an account not affiliated with the Complainant. After a complaint notice was sent by the Complainant to the Registrar, the website corresponding to the disputed domain name was suspended.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

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:

(i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LKQ trademark despite the addition of the terms "one", "stop" and "stoution" (likely a misspelling of solution) and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com";

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name for a number of reasons, including: (1) the Complainant has not granted any authorization to the Respondent to make use of its LKQ trademark, in a domain name or otherwise, (2) there is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name as a trademark, (3) the construction of the disputed domain name itself is such to carry a risk of implied affiliation that cannot constitute fair use, (4) the disputed domain name resolved to scam website which used the Complainant's LKQ mark and logo, while issuing fake invoices, fabricated to look like it originated from the Complainant despite incorrect banking details, in an attempt to secure payment by at least one of the Complainant's customers. A false email address containing the LKQ mark was used to send invoicing statements and charges to unsuspecting consumers, who think they are receiving parts and being invoiced from the Complainant;

(iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith for a number of reasons, including: (1) the Complainant's LKQ trademark predate the registration date of the disputed domain name, (2) the Respondent is in no way affiliated with the Complainant, (3) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in relation to a scam website selling fake parts, using the LKQ mark and logo, and an email address containing the LKQ mark to generate revenue from the Complainant's customers by selling fake parts and sending fake invoices alongside follow up emails regarding payment. According to the Complaint, one of its customers sent payment of USD 1,440 to the Respondent after ordering fake parts from the website corresponding to the disputed domain name. The customer received email correspondence regarding payment, along with a falsely LKQ branded invoice, and followed the instructions on the invoice. To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the scammed customer has not received the purchased part nor recovered the paid amount of money from the Respondent.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In order for the Complainant to succeed, such must prove, according to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In case all three elements above have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedy requested by the Complainant. Thus, the Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

### **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.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the LKQ mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition in front of it of the descriptive terms “one”, “stop” and what appears to be a misspelling of the term “solution” in the form “stoution”, which does not prevent the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LKQ trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LKQ mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

Although the addition of other terms, in this case “one”, “stop” and what appears to be a misspelling of the term “solution” in the form “stoution”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

In what concerns the addition of the gTLD “.com” in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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 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.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent has not received any authorization from the Complainant to make use of its LKQ mark in the disputed domain name.

Based on the available evidence, the disputed domain name has been used in relation to a website displaying the LKQ mark and logo, and selling possibly fake parts. Following orders from this website, fake invoices were sent to actual customers, who thought they were dealing with the Complainant, along with payment instructions from an email address containing the LKQ mark, under the LKQ name, to an account not affiliated with the Complainant, as an attempt to usurp the Complainant’s identity and to secure payment from at least one of the customers. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, in this case here, impersonation/passing off, and phishing activities, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant’s LKQ mark in its entirety in combination with the descriptive terms “one”, “stop” and what appears to be a misspelling of the term solution in the form “stoution”, might lead to confusion for Internet users as they may not notice the subtle misspelling of the term “solution” and think the disputed domain name is somehow related to the

Complainant and as such, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

All the above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Based on the available record, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's rights in the LKQ mark predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. In light of the above, and of the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that it is not conceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's LKQ mark, which supports a finding of bad faith registration.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate 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 notes that, the disputed domain name resolved to website selling possibly fake parts, using the LKQ mark and logo. Following orders from this website, fake invoices were sent to actual customers, who thought they were dealing with the Complainant, along with payment instructions from an email address containing the LKQ mark, under the LKQ name, to an account not affiliated with the Complainant. According to the Complaint, one of the customers appears to have sent payment of USD 1,440 after ordering possibly fake parts from this website without receiving the ordered part nor reimbursement of the paid amount. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, in this case here, impersonation/passing off, and phishing activities, 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 and 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 <onestopstoutionlkq.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Delia-Mihaela Belciu/*

**Delia-Mihaela Belciu**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 1, 2025