ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Portland Leather Goods, Inc. v. d's'da's'da's'd dasd
Case No. D2025-3616

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Portland Leather Goods, Inc., United States of America ("U.S." or "United States"), represented by Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton, LLP, U.S.

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

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <portlandleathergoodss.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 September 5, 2025. On September 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 8, 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/ Withheld for Privacy ehf service) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 9, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 10, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Dilek Zeybel as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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, Portland Leather Goods, Inc. (formerly "Portland Leather LLC"), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States, operates a business in the field of leather goods. It was founded in 2017 as Portland Leather LLC.

The Complainant is the owner of United States trademark registrations. Details of the relevant trademark registrations are as follows:

- U.S. Trademark Registration No. 6,693,622 for PORTLAND LEATHER GOODS, registered on April 5, 2022, in classes 16 and 18.

- U.S. Trademark Registration No. 6,855,612 for PORTLAND LEATHER, registered on September 27, 2022, in classes 16, 18, and 35.

The Complainant also maintains an active online presence through its official website at "www.portlandleathergoods.com", where it offers goods covered by the above-mentioned trademark registrations.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 25, 2025. According to the evidence submitted, the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage displaying identical trademarks and similar goods to those of the Complainant. At the time of the Panel's review, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive landing page.

There is no evidence on record of any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <portlandleathergoodss.shop> is confusingly similar to its earlier trademarks PORTLAND LEATHER GOODS and PORTLAND LEATHER, as it misleadingly suggests an affiliation with the Complainant and takes unfair advantage of the reputation of its marks.

Further, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent was hosting an unauthorized website featuring the Complainant's trademarks, logo, and product images, and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name or the Complainant's trademarks. The Respondent is unknown to the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that, through the unfair and unauthorized use of the disputed domain name, consumers are likely to mistakenly believe that it originates from, is associated with, or is sponsored by the Complainant, which is not the case.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no business relationship with the Complainant. It is neither an authorized dealer, distributor, nor licensee of the Complainant, and has never been permitted to use the Complainant's prior rights.

Based on the evidence submitted, the website to which the disputed domain name resolved displayed the Complainant's products on its landing page, reproduced its trademarks and logo, and featured images for which the Complainant owns the copyrights.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent impersonated the Complainant by creating a copycat website that advertised and sold leather goods purporting to originate from the Complainant, with the intent to confuse consumers and divert Internet traffic to its own website.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its PORTLAND LEATHER GOODS mark, differing only by the addition of an extra "s" to "Goods," which does not avoid confusion.

The Complainant also contends that a cease-and-desist letter was sent to the Respondent on August 29, 2025, to which no response was received.

Finally, the Complainant submits that, upon its request, the web host disabled the website and finalized takedown measures. The website remained inactive as of the filing date of the Complaint.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

The Panel further notes that a domain name consisting of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered confusingly similar to the relevant mark for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. In particular, merely adding an extra letter "s" to the Complainant's trademark PORTLAND LEATHER GOODS to form the disputed domain name <portlandleathergoodss.shop> does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.9.

In addition, it is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain ".shop" can be disregarded when assessing the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

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.

Furthermore, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without the Complainant's authorization or approval.

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 has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use. The Panel notes that additional circumstances not explicitly listed in the Policy may also support a finding of bad faith, in line with WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name entirely reproduces the Complainant's trademark PORTLAND LEATHER GOODS. The Panel finds that it is implausible that the Respondent arrived at the distinctive three-part combination domain name by coincidence, by merely adding an extra letter "s" to the disputed domain name. This indicates that the Respondent either knew or should have known the Complainant's mark and deliberately targeted it.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, e.g. impersonation, or passing off, constitutes bad faith. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.4.

In this context, the Respondent reproduced on its website the Complainant's copyrighted images, trademarks, and logo without authorization, to potentially mislead consumers.

The Panel further finds that the inactive landing page of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3. Considering that the Respondent's given name is listed as "d's'da's'da's'd dasd" combined with a randomly composed street address of "dsdsdsd dsdsdsds and city name recorded as "dsdsds", the Panel finds that the Respondent has likely used irregular or fictitious contact details, which further supports a finding of bad faith registration and use.

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 <portlandleathergoodss.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dilek Zeybel/
Dilek Zeybel
Sole Panelist
Date: October 30, 2025