

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Central Products, LLC, d/b/a Central Restaurant Products v. Samuel Chan
Case No. D2025-3874

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Central Products, LLC, d/b/a Central Restaurant Products, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Quarles & Brady LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Samuel Chan, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <central-products.com> is registered with Namecheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 23, 2025. On September 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 24, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 October 3, 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 October 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Jane Seager as the sole panelist in this matter on November 10, 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

First established in 1981 under the name “JV Partners 2, LLC”, and operating under the name “Central Products, LLC” since 2007, the Complainant is a United States-based company engaged in the wholesale distribution of commercial food service equipment and supplies.

The Complainant is the owner of the following registered service marks:

- United States Service Mark Registration No. 3,945,103, CENTRAL, registered on April 12, 2011; and
- United States Service Mark Registration No. 3,289,430, CENTRAL RESTAURANT PRODUCTS (with “RESTAURANT PRODUCTS” disclaimed), registered on September 11, 2007.

In addition to its registered marks, the Complainant is the registrant of the domain name <centralrestaurant.com>, through which it operates a website directed at commercial clients. The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <central-products.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 30, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that purports to offer food service equipment supplies (the “Respondent’s website”). The Respondent’s website appears to be incomplete, particularly in respect of the descriptions of the goods offered. The contact information displayed in the footer of the Respondent’s website includes the telephone number of the Complainant.

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.

The Complainant asserts rights in the CENTRAL and CENTRAL RESTAURANT PRODUCTS marks. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s marks.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services but rather infers that the Respondent is attempting to impersonate the Complainant and mislead Internet users.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name comprises the Complainant’s CENTRAL mark as well as two words of the Complainant’s CENTRAL RESTAURANT PRODUCTS mark. The Complainant further notes that the disputed domain name mirrors the domain name <central-products.com> owned by the Complainant, altered only by the addition of an extra hyphen. The Complainant argues that the Respondent intentionally registered a domain name that the Complainant’s customers would assume belonged to or was associated with the Complainant, in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is making bad faith use of the disputed domain name to trade off the goodwill associated with the Complainant’s marks in an attempt to mislead Internet users into believing that the Respondent’s website is affiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate on the balance of probabilities that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (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 was 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 Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the service marks CENTRAL and CENTRAL RESTAURANT PRODUCTS. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Although the terms "RESTAURANT PRODUCTS" are disclaimed in the latter mark, prior UDRP panels have held that trademark registrations with disclaimed terms typically would not affect panel assessment of standing or identity/confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.3. Here, noting the similar elements are not made up exclusively of disclaimed terms, the disclaimer on the latter mark does not affect the Panel's assessment under the first element.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's CENTRAL mark in its entirety, followed by two hyphens and the term "products". The CENTRAL mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the addition of hyphens and the term "products" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7, section 1.8.

Accordingly, 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.

The record reflects that the Complainant, a United States-based company engaged in the wholesale distribution of commercial food service equipment and supplies, has operated under the name "Central Products, LLC" since 2007. The Complainant is the owner of two United States service mark registrations, CENTRAL and CENTRAL RESTAURANT PRODUCTS, and operates a website at the domain name <centralrestaurant.com> and is also the registrant of the domain name <central-products.com>.

There is no evidence before the Panel that the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to use its marks or to register any domain name incorporating those marks.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website that purports to offer food service equipment supplies, the same business in which the Complainant is engaged. The Respondent's website appears incomplete, particularly with respect to the descriptions of the goods offered and displays the Complainant's telephone number in the footer as its own contact information. In the absence of any plausible explanation or evidence of independent rights, such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(I) of the Policy. Rather, this conduct may indicate an attempt to trade on the Complainant's reputation and to create a false association with the Complainant.

There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, or that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

On this record, the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not submitted a Response or otherwise provided evidence to rebut this showing.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out non-exhaustive circumstances that may evidence registration and use of a domain name in bad faith for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii).

In this case, the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant established rights in its CENTRAL and CENTRAL RESTAURANT PRODUCTS marks. This timing, together with the selection of a domain name incorporating the Complainant's mark and its use in connection with a website purporting to operate in the same industry, supports an inference that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its business at the time of registration.

The Respondent's website, although incomplete, is presented in a manner likely to mislead Internet users into believing it is associated with the Complainant. The use of the Complainant's phone number on the Respondent's website suggests an intent to create confusion as to the source or affiliation of the website.

The Respondent has not provided any explanation or evidence to rebut these inferences or to demonstrate good faith in the registration or use of the disputed domain name.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct falls within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name intentionally to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website, in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <central-products.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jane Seager/

Jane Seager

Sole Panelist

Date: November 28, 2025