

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Spinrite Inc. v. d's'da's'da's'd dasd
Case No. D2025-3440

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Spinrite Inc., Canada, represented by Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is d's'da's'da's'd dasd, Armenia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <yarnspirations.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 26, 2025. On August 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 28, 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 Purposes) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 28, 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 28, 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 did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on September 25, 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 based in Canada and was founded in 1952. For nearly 70 years it has developed, manufactured and sold a diverse range of craft knitting yarns, threads and related products. Between 2015 and 2019, the Complainant's total North American sales were in excess of CAD 1 billion.

The Complainant is the proprietor of Canada trademark number TMA 1057722 YARNSPIRATIONS registered on October 7, 2019, and has used the YARNSPIRATIONS mark in connection with the marketing and sale of its products since as early as September 2013.

The Complainant operates a website at the domain name <yarnspirations.com> and has since at least 2014 sold its yarn and thread products and related tools and accessories through the website.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 3, 2025. The disputed Domain Name resolves to a web portal that operates as an e-commerce platform selling yarn and crafting supplies, featuring product categories including "All Clearance Products", "Coats and Clark products", "Bernat Yarns", "Discontinued Products & Shades", "Bernat Blanket Yarns", "Red Heart Yarns", and various other yarn-related product categories. The site advertises "15%" discounts across multiple product categories and promotes services such as "Free shipping under normal circumstances and 100% free returns and exchanges," "outstanding service beyond industry standards," price matching within 7 days, and "Multiple payment options including credit cards, debit cards, bank transfers, and PayPal" with "same-day shipping for most orders".

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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. 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the 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.

The disputed domain name appears to be a commercial website selling yarn products that could potentially create consumer confusion with the legitimate website owned by the Complainant at the domain name <yarnspirations.com>, which is the established yarn retailer offering over 10,000 free patterns and selling yarn brands like Red Heart, Bernat, Caron, Patons, and Coats & Clark.

The Panel finds the composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation which cannot give rise to any rights or legitimate interests. [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.

As stated above, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered at least one decade after the Complainant's registration of its mark and the Complainant had been selling goods under its trademarks well before the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name and the contents on the website which the disputed domain name directs purportedly offering for sale the Complainant's products with no disclaimer of any kind, indicating the Respondent's knowledge of and familiarity with the Complainant's brand and business. As such, the Respondent's use of the trademark in the disputed domain name cannot be a coincidence.

The Respondent is attempting to attract, confuse, and invite the Complainant's users to purchase possibly fake yarn products for its own commercial gain. Such use of the disputed domain name falls into bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Finally the Panel notes that when examining a domain registration under the designation consisting of nonsensical or arbitrary character sequences such as "d's'da's'da's'd dasd" and corresponding Whois registration information displaying Name as "d's'da's'da's'd dasd", Address as "dsdsdsd dsdsdsds", City as "dsdsds", State or Province as "sdsdsdsd", Postal Code as "059888", and country listed as Armenia, several evidentiary factors may support a finding of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy.

The provision of patently false, incomplete, or nonsensical contact information in the Whois database constitutes a significant indicum of bad faith under paragraph four of the UDRP. The Policy contemplates that registrants shall provide accurate and reliable contact information, and the deliberate furnishing of fictitious data such as repetitive keyboard patterns, meaningless character strings, and implausible address configurations demonstrates a conscious effort to obscure the true identity of the registrant and evade accountability. Such conduct evidences an intention to shield oneself from legitimate inquiry and potential enforcement actions, which panels have consistently recognized as probative of bad faith registration.

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 <yarnspirations.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: October 9, 2025