

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lincoln Global, Inc., The Lincoln Electric Company v. 黄道贵 黄道贵
(dao gui huang)
Case No. D2025-2920

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Lincoln Global, Inc. and The Lincoln Electric Company,¹ United States of America (“United States”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is 黄道贵 黄道贵 (dao gui huang), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lincolnelectric.top> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 23, 2025. On July 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 August 4, 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 in English on August 6, 2025.

On August 4, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On August 6, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s language of proceeding submission.

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”).

¹ Referred to herein, in the singular, as “the Complainant”.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on August 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a leading designer and manufacturer of welding products, accessories and systems, founded in 1895, and operating worldwide under the trade mark LINCOLN ELECTRIC (the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registrations in jurisdictions worldwide for the Trade Mark, including Chinese registration No. 3175662, with a registration date of June 21, 2003; and United States registration No. 2350082, with a registration date of May 16, 2000.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is an individual located in China.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was registered on June 3, 2025.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name has not been used in respect of any active 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that, in light of the repute of the Trade Mark, the fact the disputed domain name is identical to the Trade Mark, and the fact the Respondent has set up an MX (mail exchanger) record to enable the Respondent to send and receive emails using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and its Trade Mark in registering and using the domain disputed name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name comprises Latin text; the Complainant previously sent a cease-and desist letter in English to the Respondent (which was ignored by the Respondent); and requiring translation of the Complaint would involve additional expense and delay.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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.

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.

In addition, the Panel notes the nature of the disputed domain name (being identical to the relevant Trade Mark), which carries a high risk of implied association. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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, 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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Additionally, Panels have found that the use of a domain name for purposes other than hosting trade mark abusive content can constitute bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's Trade Mark, the active MX records in respect of the disputed domain name, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <lincolnelectric.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2025