

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

JD Sports Fashion Plc v. liu yangjun
Case No. D2025-3898

1. The Parties

The Complainant is JD Sports Fashion Plc, United Kingdom, internally represented.

The Respondent is liu yangjun, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <technicalsuk.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 24, 2025. On September 25, 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 (Details unavailable, redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 29, 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 October 1, 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 October 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on October 29, 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 a leading global omnichannel retailer of sports fashion wear and outdoor brands.

The Complainant was founded in North West England in 1981. The Complainant operates over 4,500 stores across 49 countries with a strong presence in the United Kingdom, Europe, North America, and Asia Pacific.

The Complainant operates in excess of 1,250 stores under the JD SPORTS fascia brand globally including, but not limited to, the United Kingdom, the European Union, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, Thailand, and Singapore. In the financial year 2025, the Complainant opened 226 stores under the JD SPORTS fascia brand. Relevant extracts from the 2025 Annual Report of the Complainant are attached at Annex 4 of the Complaint.

In addition to its physical stores, the Complainant operates e-commerce websites from which products can be ordered. Such websites include, but are not limited to, “www.jdsports.co.uk”, “www.global.jdsports.com”, “www.jdsports.fr”, “www.jdsports.be”, “www.jdsports.nl”, and “www.jdsports.es”.

Printouts from these websites that were obtained on July 23, 2025, and September 11, 2025, are provided at Annex 5 of the Complaint. The Complainant’s subsidiary companies Go Outdoors Retail Limited and Blacks Outdoor Retail Limited also operate the following e-commerce websites from which products can be ordered, which are as follows “www.blacks.co.uk” and “www.gooutdoors.co.uk”. Printouts from these websites have been obtained on September 11, 2025, and are provided at Annex 5 of the Complaint.

The Complainant has trademark registrations globally for the mark TECHNICALS including but not limited to the following:

- United Kingdom (“UK”) Trade Mark Registration No. UK00002386672 TECHNICALS, of Blacks Outdoor Retail Limited, registered on July 17, 2009.
- UK Trade Mark Registration No. UK00911905023 TECHNICALS, of Blacks Outdoor Retail Limited registered on November 29, 2013.
- UK Trade Mark Registration No. UK00003865372 TECHNICALS (logo), of Blacks Outdoor Retail Limited registered on August 8, 2025.
- UK Trade Mark Registration No. UK00002495184 TECHNICALS (logo), of Blacks Outdoor Retail Limited registered on January 2, 2009.
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 011905023 TECHNICALS, of Blacks Outdoor Retail Limited registered on November 29, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 1, 2024. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that appears to be an online store 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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a 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.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondent's default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

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 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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms like "uk" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the composition of the disputed domain name (comprising the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and the addition of the term "uk"), together with the non-authorized content of the disputed domain name (a website that appears to be an online store of the Complainant) create a risk of Internet user confusion.

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 disputed domain name contains a reproduction of the Complainant's registered trademark. The Complainant's trademark registrations and use made of those registrations pre-date the disputed domain name created in 2024.
- According to the Complainant, the disputed website is displaying unauthorized photographs belonging to the Complainant, which include images of its models and products. The website not only reproduces this content without permission, but also displays prices and product listings directly underneath these images, thereby offering for sale the Complainant's products in a manner that suggests a false affiliation or authorization. Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the disputed website features fabricated customer reviews, which mislead consumers and exacerbate the likelihood of confusion. In addition, the website contains pop-up advertisements, many of which appear to be affiliate links to third-party websites, indicating an attempt to derive monetary gain from this deceptive use. Accordingly, the Respondent is using an identical mark in connection with identical goods in the disputed domain name, with the intention of misleading consumers, capitalizing on the Complainant's goodwill.
- The Panel visited the website at the disputed domain name and was able to verify that it contains what appears to be an online store of the Complainant with no disclaimer.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <technicalsuk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: November 11, 2025