

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hong Kong Sun Rise Trading Limited v. jin xl
Case No. D2025-3336

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hong Kong Sun Rise Trading Limited, Hong Kong, China, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is jin xl, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <greenworkstoolsvip.com> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 19, 2025. On August 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 21, 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 August 22, 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 August 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Sok Ling MOI as the sole panelist in this matter on September 19, 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, Hong Kong Sun Rise Trading Limited, a corporation headquartered in Hong Kong, China. The company specializes in the wholesale distribution of industrial machinery and equipment (including garden and home power tools).

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3851110 for GREENWORKS in class 7, registered on September 21, 2010;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 6996861 for GREENWORKS in class 12, registered on March 7, 2023;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 6615681 for GREENWORKS in classes 7, 9, 11, 12, and 35, registered on January 11, 2022;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 017163817 for GREENWORKS in classes 7, 9, 11, 12, 17, 21, and 35, registered on November 26, 2020; and
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 010300655 for GREENWORKS TOOLS (figurative) in classes 7 and 11, registered on March 5, 2012.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names containing the GREENWORKS mark, including the following: <greenworkstools.com> (registered since 2009), <greenworkstools.asia>, <greenworkstools.eu>, <greenworkstools.us>, <greenworkstools.uk>, and <greenworks.uk>.

The Complainant operates its official website at “www.greenworkstools.com”, and uses it to inform potential consumers about its GREENWORKS mark and its products and services.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 10, 2025. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a website mimicking the look and feel of the Complainant’s official website, displaying the GREENWORKS trademark and purportedly offering for sale garden and home power tools under the GREENWORKS brand.

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:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark, as it incorporates GREENWORKS in its entirety;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order for the disputed domain name to be transferred:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the respondent 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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed 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. See 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the GREENWORKS and GREENWORKS TOOLS marks are reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Panel finds the marks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (namely, "tools" and/or "vip") 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Top-Level Domain ("TLD") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded under the first element confusing 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 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has confirmed that the Respondent is not in any way affiliated with the Complainant or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the GREENWORKS mark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating the GREENWORKS mark. The Respondent appears to be an individual by the name of "jin xl". There is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "Greenworks" or has any rights in the term "Greenworks" or in the disputed domain name.

Additionally, the Complainant claims that the Respondent's webpage is a near-identical replica of the Complainant's webpage, using exact images that the Complainant uses on its webpages, and purporting to offer the GREENWORKS branded products. This, according to the Complainant, is an attempt to mislead consumers and divert the Complainant's customers to the Respondent's webpage.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, using the Complainant's trademarks plus the word "tools" and/or the term "vip", carries a risk of implied affiliation. UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name several years after the Complainant registered its domain name <greenworkstools.com> in 2009, and registered its first trademark for GREENWORKS in 2010. As the Complainant enjoys an online presence, it is implausible that the Respondent is not familiar with the Complainant's GREENWORKS mark and products. The Panel further notes from the evidence submitted by the Complainant that the Respondent's webpage uses a similar green colour scheme as used on the Complainant's webpage, and displays a "greenworks" logo which is in identical font style as the Complainant's "greenworks" logo, and purportedly offers for sale garden and home power tool products bearing the GREENWORKS brand. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's webpage reproduces the Complainant's copyright-protected product images, and that the overall look and feel of the Respondent's webpage mimics that of the Complainant's webpage (a "copycat version"). The Respondent did not dispute the Complainant's contention.

By registering the disputed domain name which is almost identical to the Complainant's domain name <greenworkstools.com> (differing only by the addition of the term "vip") and purportedly offering products under the GREENWORKS brand, the Respondent is attempting to attract Internet users to the Respondent's webpage by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source of the Respondent's webpage. The circumstances referred to in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy are applicable. Accordingly, the Respondent's choice, registration and use of the disputed domain name are in bad faith.

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 <greenworkstoolsvip.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sok Ling Moi/

Sok Ling Moi

Sole Panelist

Date: October 3, 2025