

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Masco Corporation and Delta Faucet Company v. yang xiurong
Case No. D2025-3319

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Masco Corporation, United States of America (“United States” or “USA”), and Delta Faucet Company, United States, represented by Demys Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is yang xiurong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <deltafaucet.shop> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 18, 2025. On August 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 20, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on August 22, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on August 27, 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 September 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on September 26, 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 First Complainant “Masco Corporation” is incorporated in Delaware, United States and headquartered in Livonia, Michigan, USA. The First Complainant is an American designer, manufacturer and distributor of decorative architectural products and plumbing products. These products include architectural coatings and exterior wood care products, glass shower doors and shower accessories, decorative and outdoor lighting, cabinet, door and window hardware, faucets, spas, exercise pools and fitness systems, shower heads and handheld showers, bathtubs, shower bases, shower enclosures, and toilets.

The First Complainant was founded in 1929 as Masco Screw Products Company. Today the First Complainant owns around 100 subsidiaries, operates 38 manufacturing facilities of which 30 are in North America, and employs 19,000 people around the globe.

The First Complainant’s portfolio of industry-leading brands includes BRIZO, DELTA and HANSGRÖHE faucets, bath and shower fixtures, KICHLER decorative and outdoor lighting, LIBERTY branded decorative and functional hardware, HOT SPRING spas, and KRAUS faucet, bathing and showering products.

The Second Complainant is Delta Faucet Company which was founded by the First Complainant in 1954 with the introduction of the single-handle faucet, a design that has become a standard in the industry. It is headquartered in Indianapolis, Indiana, United States, and operates as a subsidiary of the First Complainant. The Second Complainant is known for its innovative designs and is one of the largest manufacturers of residential and commercial faucets in the United States.

The Second Complainant operates a range of brands, including DELTA, and is the proprietor of said registered marks on which both Complainants rely upon in this administrative proceeding. The Second Complainant operates its official website from the URL “www.deltafaucetcompany.com”.

The Second Complainant’s DELTA is the flagship brand and offers on-trend designs with a focus on integrating technology, such as hands-free and voice-activated features. The brand’s product range includes a variety of faucets, kitchen sinks, toilets and steam controls.

The Second Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations:

United Kingdom, trademark DELTA, registration number: UK0000312987B, date of registration May 11, 1909, International Class number 11.

United States of America, trademark DELTA, registration number: 668880, date of registration October 28, 1958, International Class number 11.

China, trademark DELTA registration number: 876715, date of registration October 07, 1996, International Class number 11.

The disputed domain name <deltafaucet.shop> is registered on June 25, 2025. It resolves to a website that mirrors the Complainants official site, reproducing their trademarks and content.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the DELTA trademark, notwithstanding the inclusion of the additional term "faucet". It is asserted that this addition of the term "faucet" is insufficient to render the disputed domain name distinct from the DELTA trademark, since the descriptive term relates to the Complainants' products.

The Complainants assert that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests regarding the disputed domain name. According to the Complainants, the Respondent has not made legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainants further alleged that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainants request the transfer of the disputed domain name to the second Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Matter – Consolidation of Multiple Complainants

The Complainants submitted a request for consolidation in this proceeding and in their Complaint. Pursuant to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.1, the consolidation of multiple complainants filing a joint complaint against one respondent is subject to the discretion of the appointed panel.

In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against one respondent, the appointed panel should consider whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion; and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. The Panel therefore submits that the consolidation of the Complainants would be appropriate in the present proceeding and would not have any unfair prejudicial effect on the Respondent. The Panel notes that the Complainants in this administrative proceeding are affiliated since the Second Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of the First Complainant. As such, the two entities have sufficient common legal interest in the DELTA trademark that is incorporated in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel finds that it is fair and equitable under the circumstances of the present case to permit consolidation as the Complainants are not only affiliated companies as parent and subsidiary but also have common interests, and therefore it is appropriate to have joint Complainants in this proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Matters – Three Elements

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainants to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; (iii) and the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The requested remedy may only be granted if the above criteria are met. At the outset, the Panel notes that the applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence". See section 4.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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

The Complainants have 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 Complainants have established rights in the DELTA trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the DELTA mark in its entirety, together with the descriptive term “faucet”, which directly relates to the Complainants products. Such an addition does not avoid confusing similarity as the mark DELTA remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Additionally, it is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain “gTLD” (in this case “.shop”) is generally disregarded when considering whether a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) states that “the applicable Top-Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name (e.g., ‘.com’, ‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusion similarity test”.

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 the UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case indicating that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants’ 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 the present case, the Complainants submitted that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee or affiliate of the Complainants, nor has it been authorized to use the Complainants’ mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has made a bona fide offering of goods or services before notice of the dispute.

The use of the disputed domain name consisted of mirroring the Complainants official website, reproducing its content and design. Such impersonation cannot constitute a bona fide offering or legitimate noncommercial use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy. Panels have consistently held that website replication amounts to misrepresentation and deception (see *Safe Banking Systems, LLC v. Zhang Xuefeng*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0397](#)).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1).

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.

The Complainants DELTA trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by several decades. Given the mark's distinctiveness and reputation, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainants' rights when registering the domain name. The inclusion of the term "faucet" further reinforces the association with the Complainants business.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to mirror the Complainants website demonstrates intent to mislead users by creating a false impression of affiliation or endorsement. This conduct constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith, meeting the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <deltafaucet.shop> be transferred to the second Complainant Delta Faucet Company.

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/

Ada L. Redondo Aguilera

Sole Panelist

Date: October 10, 2025