

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

POCKETEC, INC. v. Hyeonseok Kim, Honest Trading Corp
Case No. D2025-3063

1. The Parties

Complainant is POCKETEC, INC., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Chipperson Law Group, P.C., United States.

Respondent is Hyeonseok Kim, Honest Trading Corp, United States, represented by Law Offices of Chung & Kim, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <coppertechsports.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 31, 2025. On August 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 4, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Honest Trading Corp of New Jersey) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to Complainant on August 6, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 11, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 4, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on September 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 Parties have made many allegations and arguments and have put into the record various pieces of evidence, which are not necessary to the disposition of this UDRP case. Such allegations, arguments, and evidence will not be addressed in this decision, for simplicity's sake.

According to the Complaint:

"Complainant Pocketec, Inc. ('Pocketec') launched and began selling golf gloves over 30 years ago after it incorporated in the state of New Jersey on November 8, 1990 [...] and later became a Florida corporation on March 10, 2006 [...]. Complainant registered its domain names, www.coppertechglove.com and www.coppertechgloves.com ('Complainant's Domain Names'), on September 28, 2015 [...], and has continuously sold COPPER TECH branded golf gloves through www.coppertechglove.com and www.coppertechgloves.com since at least as early as February 14, 2016."

"Complainant promoted its COPPER TECH branded gloves at the 2016 PGA Merchandise Show in Orlando, Florida from January 27, 2016 through January 29, 2016. Around March 1, 2021, Complainant introduced its COPPER TECH PLUS line of gloves which are also sold at www.coppertechglove.com and www.coppertechgloves.com."

"Since introduction of the COPPER TECH branded golf gloves, Pocketec has grown COPPER TECH and COPPER TECH PLUS into a recognizable brand in both the United States and internationally which sells and/or has been sold at major retailers including, but not limited to: the Professional Golfer's Association ('PGA') Store [...]; Costco; Haggin Oaks; Edwin Watts, Dicks Sporting Goods, Sports Authority, Academy Sports, and QVC. Complainant's COPPER TECH products have been mentioned in many major publications including, without limitation: Sports Illustrated, Vogue, the Today Show, Good Morning America, Golf Digest [...], The New York Times, The San Francisco Chronicles, Fitness Magazine, and the Golf Wire [...]. Complainant also has entered into and has current retail agreements with various retailers..."

By way of example, Complainant annexed to the Complaint a June 5, 2018 article in *The Golf Wire* magazine, entitled "Copper Tech Copper-Infused Compression Golf Gloves Top Father's Day Hot List." The article refers to Complainant Pocketec, Inc. as the "manufacturers of Copper Tech." Also annexed to the Complaint are web pages from retailers Costco and PGA Golf Superstore which feature the COPPER TECH golf glove. The PGA web page also refers to Complainant by name.

According to the record in this case, Complainant does not hold any live registered trademarks for the marks COPPER TECH and COPPER TECH PLUS. Complainant holds some trademark registrations for some other products which sell under entirely different brands.

The Domain Name was registered on August 25, 2024. The Domain Name resolves to Respondent's website, at which, among other things, COPPER TECH PLUS golf gloves are offered for sale.

According to Complainant:

"Respondent's website displays images of multiple products of the Complainant, or illegitimate copies thereof. For example, Respondent sells the same Copper Tech Plus Men's Golf Glove in white/charcoal ("Example Complainant Product") [...] that Complainant sells through the PGA Tour Superstore in association with its name, Pocketec [...]. In addition to Respondent's product looking identical to

Complainant's product, and using the COPPER TECH mark, the product sold by Respondent has two of Complainant's domain names (i.e., coppertechglove.com and ladyclassic.com) printed thereon."

Respondent states:

"Respondent has been actively marketing, and has successfully sold a high volume of COPPER TECH-branded gloves. Sales from 2020-2023 are approximately 20,000 gloves, and from 2023-2025 approximately 48,000 gloves. As a distributor of the COPPER TECH golf gloves, and owner of the Amazon Brand Store 'Copper Tech Store', Respondent has used various platforms such as Instagram, Facebook and Tiktok to market their goods, is well-known and consumers identify the source of the gloves to be Respondent. [...] Respondent's high number of sales and reviews demonstrates that consumers would identify the source of COPPER TECH products to be Respondent, not Complainant."

"Complainant is simply one non-exclusive distributor of the copper infused gloves and is now attempting to confuse consumers regarding the source of goods. The copper infused gloves were originally developed by Respondent's CEO and in 1999, the official launch of the glove was by Respondent's CEO's affiliate, PT. Sukses Komerindo. (Complainant's Annex 2, Birth of the Copper Tech) Thereafter, U.S. sales and marketing for the gloves commenced in 2000 by PT. Sukses Komerindo's Affiliate Korman Sports, whereupon active marketing for the gloves was completed under the brand COPPER TECH (Annex 3, website marketing commenced on April 1, 2014). Complainant only alleges sales beginning 2016 of the COPPER TECH branded gloves as one distributor of the product."

On December 31, 2019, Respondent registered – on the United States Patent and Trademark Office's Supplemental Register (not its Principal Register) – the word mark COPPER ADVANCED TECH (Reg. No. 5,952,079) in connection with: "Baseball gloves; Batting gloves; Billiard gloves; Fencing gloves; Gloves for American football; Golf gloves; Karate gloves; Lacrosse gloves; Rowing gloves; Running gloves; Sky diving gloves; Waterski gloves; Work-out gloves; Yoga gloves; Gauntlets; all of the foregoing containing copper."

"Respondent's CEO was the inventor of the copper infused gloves, and Respondent's CEO's affiliate Korman Sports has been using the Copper Tech trademark since 2014. [...] Respondent is currently the only owner of a COPPER TECH-related registered trademark as Respondent is owner of the USPTO trademark COPPER ADVANCED TECH, registered on December 31, 2019 via an assignment on August 4, 2024. [...] In contrast, Complainant's trademark applications for related trademarks have been rejected due to Respondent's registered trademark and prior-filed trademark."

"Respondent was also appointed as Authorized Distributor of Copper Tech+ and Copper Advanced Tech golf gloves on January 1, 2020 and became the Exclusive Distributor of Copper Tech+ and Copper Advanced Tech golf gloves on August 1, 2025. [...] The President of Korman Sports has also confirmed via a 'Letter of Authorization' dated August 18, 2025 that Respondent is exclusively authorized to sell Copper Tech - branded gloves [...]. Further, Respondent is owner of the Amazon Brand Store, 'Copper Tech Store'. (Annex 18) Respondent's Brand Store is rated as an 'Amazon Choice' store, having high volume sales and more than 300 reviews for one product."

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent's essential position is reflected above in the "Factual Background" section.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Panel is prepared to find, for purposes of this proceeding, that Complainant has rights in the trademark COPPER TECH through use demonstrated in the record and some unsolicited media coverage reflected in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to that mark. The Domain Name incorporates the COPPER TECH mark in its entirety and adds the word "sports." The COPPER TECH mark remains recognizable within the Domain Name, despite these differences.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are 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.

The Panel will not address this issue, given its conclusion in the "Bad Faith" section below.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation," are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in "bad faith":

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel concludes, on the record provided here, that Complainant has not proven that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. The record presented by the Parties shows that both Parties have some history with the COPPER TECH (and similarly named) products. If one Party has a superior claim to the trademark, that does not necessarily translate into a successful UDRP claim. It is apparent that Respondent has had some relationship with the COPPER TECH gloves over the years, such that it would be impossible to call this dispute a clear case of cybersquatting, which is what the UDRP was designed chiefly to address. The Parties' dispute belongs in another forum where a more robust presentation of arguments and evidence may be considered and tested.

The Complaint fails.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: October 5, 2025