

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

YSN Imports, LLC v. Sama Bertrand Forkoh
Case No. D2025-3401

1. The Parties

The Complainant is YSN Imports, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Saul Ewing LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Sama Bertrand Forkoh, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kingflameproducts.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 23, 2025. On August 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 25, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 25, 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 29, 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 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on September 3, 2025. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on September 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown 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 Complainant is in the business of selling, among other things, propane tanks, propane-powered goods and related accessories. It owns the trademark FLAME KING, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration, including United States Reg. No. 3188283, registered on December 19, 2006.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on February 1, 2025. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to set up a website where it purports to offer for sale and promote propane-related products that bear the Complainant's FLAME KING mark, including by the use of the Complainant's own product images.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not substantively respond to the Complainant's contentions. On September 3, 2025, the Respondent sent a one-sentence email to the Center stating "[if] my domain name is canceled and blocked I will need a refund."

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name 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. The Panel finds that all three of these elements have been met in this case.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. 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. *Id.* This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the FLAME KING mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the FLAME KING mark in a reversed order (“kingflame”) and appends the descriptive term “products”. The inversion of the two words comprising the Complainant’s FLAME KING mark and the addition of a dictionary term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See *Carrefour SA v. cesar jimenez*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4384](#). The FLAME KING mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

The content of the website associated with the domain name is usually disregarded by panels when assessing confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.15. In some instances, however, panels have taken note of the content of the website associated with a domain name to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name. Guided by these principles, the Panel takes note of the content of the Respondent’s website – which purports to sell the Complainant’s products – to confirm the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s mark.

It is standard practice when comparing a disputed domain name to a complainant’s trademarks, to not take the extension into account. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests shifts to the Respondent (with the burden of proof always remaining with the Complainant). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1; *AXA SA v. Huade Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1289](#).

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Respondent is not licensed or otherwise authorized to use the FLAME KING mark; (2) the Respondent is not associated with or affiliated with the Complainant; (3) the Respondent has no right or authority to represent itself as a store for or an authorized retailer of the Complainant’s products; and (4) the disputed domain name displays the Complainant’s FLAME KING mark.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this prima facie showing.

The Panel, sua sponte, considers whether the Oki Data test might apply to determine whether the Respondent might have a legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name. See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#); [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8. The four cumulative Oki Data criteria are: (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue; (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services; (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder; and (iv) the respondent must not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the trademark.

The Panel finds the Oki Data test is not satisfied. In particular, the third element is not met: the website does not accurately or prominently disclose the Respondent’s lack of relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent displays a copyright statement with the text “Copyright © 2025 – King Flame Products”. These facts do not support rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy requires a complainant to establish that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The evidence supports a finding that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its FLAME KING trademark. The disputed domain name was registered in 2025, well after the Complainant's trademark rights had been established. The website at the disputed domain name promotes and offers for sale propane-related products bearing the Complainant's FLAME KING mark, including by use of the Complainant's own product images. The Respondent's actions suggest an intent to impersonate or pass off its website as being associated with the Complainant.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, a finding of bad faith is appropriate where the Respondent has "intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [its] web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [its] web site or location or of a product or service on [its] web site or location." That is the case here.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this third element under 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 <kingflameproducts.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: October 10, 2025