ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Helinox Inc., Helinox Pte. Ltd. v. Trycia Pfeffer
Case No. D2025-2725

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Helinox Inc., Republic of Korea, and Helinox Pte. Ltd., Singapore, both represented by Ravindran Associates LLP, Singapore.

The Respondent is Trycia Pfeffer, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <helinoxlife.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 10, 2025. On July 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 11, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 11, 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 July 14, 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 July 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Benoit Van Asbroeck as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 Complainants are Helinox Inc. (the "Complainant 1") and Helinox Pte. Ltd. (the "Complainant 2"). The Complainant 1 creates lightweight chairs, tables, cots and accessories for outdoor use, and the Complainant 2 is an affiliated / related entity of the Complainant 1 based in Singapore. The Complainant 1 and the Complainant 2 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as the "Complainant".

The Complainant 1 is the owner of registered trademarks in the mark HELINOX, amongst which:

- International Trademark No. 1430204 for HELINOX, registered on September 6, 2018, in International Class 20, covering the following designated countries: Australia, Switzerland, China, Colombia, India, Norway, New Zealand, Singapore, United States, and Viet Nam;

- International Trademark No. 1617262 for HELINOX, registered on August 12, 2021, in International Class 3, covering the following designated countries / regions: Australia, Switzerland, China, European Union, United Kingdom ("UK"), Japan, Singapore, United States, and Viet Nam.

The Complainant 2 is also the owner of registered trademarks in the mark HELINOX, amongst which:

- International Trademark No. 1301739 for Helinox, registered on March 2, 2016, in International Class 20, covering the following designated countries / regions: Australia, Switzerland, Israel, Mongolia, New Zealand, African Intellectual Property Organization, Philippines, Russian Federation, Singapore, United States, and Viet Nam;

- International Trademark No. 1510203 for HELINOX, registered on December 5, 2019, in International Class 35, covering the following designated countries / regions: Australia, Switzerland, European Union, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, United States, and Viet Nam.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 19, 2025, well after the Complainant secured rights in the mark HELINOX. According to evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name redirects to the <helinox.eu> domain name, which resolves to the official Helinox EU website. Both this domain name and website are owned by a company affiliated with the Complainant: Helinox Europe B.V.

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.

With respect to the first element, the Complainant contends that it has rights in the mark HELINOX and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to this mark. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name reproduces the entirety of its HELINOX trademark and only adds the generic word "life" at the end of the disputed domain name. The Complainant points out that the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Regarding the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name merely copies the Complainant's HELINOX trademark to which the Complainant has sole and exclusive rights. In addition, the Complainant notes that they have also not authorized the Respondent to use its HELINOX trademark either in whole or in part, in any manner whatsoever, including as a domain name.

On the third element, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name redirecting to the <helinox.eu> domain name and website is an indicator of bad faith since it demonstrates that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and retaining control over this redirection creates a real or implied ongoing threat to the Complainant. In addition, the Complainant points out, the redirection reinforces the likelihood of confusion given that users are likely to consider the disputed domain name to be in some way endorsed by or connected with the Complainant. Further or in the alternative, the Complainant notes that the passive holding doctrine applies to this case since the redirection to the <helinox.eu> domain name, which resolves to the official Helinox EU website, is no more than passive holding of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Complainants

The Panel notes that the Complaint was filed by two Complainants. The Panel is therefore required to decide whether it will permit this Complaint filed by multiple complainants (paragraph 10(e) of the Rules).

The Panel finds that the Complainant 1 and the Complainant 2 have a common grievance against the Respondent since the Complainant 1 and the Complainant 2 are related entities, and it appears from the evidence on record that both the Complainant 1 and the Complainant 2 own trademarks in the mark HELINOX, which this Complaint relies on. Considering these facts and the Respondent's failure to submit any response to the Complaint, the Panel believes that it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation.

Accordingly, the Panel permits the Complaint filed by the Complainant 1 and the Complainant 2.

B. 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 the HELINOX trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the 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 "life", 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.

Finally, as for the applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), i.e., the suffix ".com", the Panel holds that this can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent does not use, nor has the Respondent made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and the Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, it appears from the case file that the disputed domain name merely redirects to the <helinox.eu> domain name, which resolves to the official Helinox EU website, both owned and operated by an affiliate of the Complainant. This kind of use of the disputed domain name does not represent a bona fide offering and does not support rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.3.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's HELINOX mark (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy). As the Panel has found above under the first element, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the HELINOX mark. In addition, the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to redirect to the official Helinox EU website. The Panel agrees with the Respondent that these are indicators of bad faith since these facts show that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and the HELINOX trademark. These facts also show an intention to confuse users into believing that the disputed domain name belongs to or is somehow endorsed or connected to the Complainant. These circumstances, in combination with the Respondent's clear absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, are indeed strong indicators of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.4.

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. The following other circumstances further support a finding of bad faith.

The Panel believes that the Respondent knew or, at least, should have known at the time of registration that the disputed domain name included the Complainant's HELINOX trademark. As demonstrated by the Complainant, its HELINOX trademarks were registered many years before the registration of the disputed domain name in several countries, in particular also in the registered country of residence of the Respondent, the United States. In addition, the disputed domain name incorporates the HELINOX mark in its entirety and includes the dictionary term "life". This dictionary term does not dispel the confusing similarity. All of these facts indicate that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and the HELINOX trademarks and its registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name may accordingly also be inferred from these circumstances. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.2.

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 <helinoxlife.com> be transferred to the Complainant 1 (Helinox Inc.).

/Benoit Van Asbroeck/
Benoit Van Asbroeck
Sole Panelist
Date: August 21, 2025