

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

JD SPORTS FASHION PLC v. yu liangdong  
Case No. D2025-3899

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is JD SPORTS FASHION PLC, United Kingdom ("UK"), internally represented.

The Respondent is Yu liangdong, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <sonnetilondon.com> is registered with Dynadot 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 September 26, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 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 November 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Iris Quadrio as the sole panelist in this matter on November 7, 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, JD Sports Fashion Plc (“the Complainant”), is a leading global omnichannel retailer specializing in sports fashion apparel, footwear, and accessories. Founded in 1981 in North West England, the Complainant has experienced sustained growth over four decades and today operates a major international retail network. As of 2025, the Complainant manages over 4,500 stores across 49 countries, with a strong presence in the UK, Europe, North America, and the Asia-Pacific region.

Under its primary retail banner, JD SPORTS, the Complainant operates more than 1,250 stores worldwide, including locations in the UK, the European Union, the United States of America (“United States”), Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, Thailand, and Singapore. In the financial year 2025 alone, the Complainant opened 226 new JD SPORTS stores.

The Complainant has Internet presence and operates a substantial e-commerce network through official websites including, inter alia, “[www.jdsports.co.uk](http://www.jdsports.co.uk)”, “[www.jdsports.fr](http://www.jdsports.fr)”, “[www.jdsports.be](http://www.jdsports.be)”, “[www.jdsports.nl](http://www.jdsports.nl)”, “[www.jdsports.es](http://www.jdsports.es)”, and “[www.jdsports.com](http://www.jdsports.com)”, from which authenticated SONNETI-branded products can be purchased. SONNETI is one of the Complainant’s proprietary fashion brands, commercialized exclusively through the JD Sports retail ecosystem and its controlled online platforms.

Moreover, the Complainant is the owner of the trademark SONNETI in many jurisdictions, UK Registration (“Reg.”) No. UK00001415411 registered since August 7, 1992, in class 25; Reg. No. UK00901280049, registered since October 16, 2000, in classes 9, 18, 25; Reg. No. UK00910604353, registered since June 27, 2012, in classes 3, 14, 16, 25; European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) Reg. No. 001280049, registered since October 16, 2000, in classes 9, 18, 25; EUIPO Reg. No. 010604353, registered since June 27, 2012, in classes 3, 14, 16, 25; and United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) Reg. No. 5941383, registered since December 24, 2019, in class 25.

The Complainant holds registrations for the mark SONNETI that predate the registration of the disputed domain name, including in the UK, the EU, and the United States. The Complainant’s earliest registration for SONNETI dates back to August 7, 1992.

The website corresponding to the disputed domain name <sonnetilondon.com> redirects users to a webpage <[sonnetilondon.brandswbsites.com](http://sonnetilondon.brandswbsites.com)>, where images appearing to originate from the official JD Sports website are displayed together with what appear to be customer reviews. The website presents itself as offering SONNETI-branded products, although there is no indication that the site is operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant, with the sole exception of a disclaimer displayed at the bottom of the page stating “*Disclaimer: This website is an independent, fan-created platform that provides content about various brands. It is neither affiliated with, endorsed by, nor officially associated with these brands. All trademarks, logos, and brand names mentioned are the property of their respective owners. We are merely a platform for publishing content and do not sell products*”. The Panel notes that at the time of the submission of the Complaint, as per the Complainant’s evidence, the website at the disputed domain name did not display this disclaimer.

The Respondent is identified as Yu Liangdong, located in China. No evidence has been submitted by the Respondent to demonstrate any business activities, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Lastly, the disputed domain name was registered on June 17, 2024.

## 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <sonnetilondon.com> is confusingly similar to its trademark SONNETI on which the Complainant has prior rights.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name <sonnetilondon.com> and it is not related in any way with the Complainant. The Complainant is not related to the Respondent in any way and has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use its SONNETI trademark.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, as it redirects users to a website displaying images and promotional material identical to those used by the Complainant, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion by making users believe that the site is an official platform of JD Sports or its SONNETI trademark.

Finally, the Complainant requests the Administrative Panel appointed in this administrative proceeding that <sonnetilondon.com> and its redirection site "<https://sonnetilondon.brandswebsites.com>" be transferred to the Complainant<sup>1</sup>.

### B. Respondent

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name, the Complainant must prove each of the following, namely that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar with 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 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name <sonnetilondon.com> and its redirection site at "<https://sonnetilondon.brandswebsites.com>". The Complaint accurately identifies the disputed domain name as <sonnetilondon.com> in the corresponding section of the Complaint. The Panel notes that the redirection of the disputed domain name leads to a third-level domain <sonnetilondon.brandswebsites.com>. The Panel notes that under the Policy the available remedy for a Complainant is transfer or cancellation of the disputed domain name and that the domain name <sonnetilondon.brandswebsites.com> consists of a third-level domain to which the Policy is not applicable directly, consequently the remedy in this proceeding is limited to the disputed domain name <sonnetilondon.com>.

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 Complainant's mark is reproduced in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy, consistent with [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Disregarding the Top-Level Domain ".com", in accordance with section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the only difference between the Complainant's registered trademark and the disputed domain name is the addition of the geographic term "london".

It is well established in prior UDRP decisions that the mere addition of a term to a complainant's mark does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. For instance, in *LinkedIn Corporation v. Daphne Reynolds*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1679](#), the panel found that the addition of the term "jobs" to the complainant's trademark LINKEDIN did not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Similarly, in the present case, the inclusion of the geographic term "london" does not prevent the confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

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 Complainant has claimed that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or to use the SONNETI trademark in any manner. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that the Respondent has, or could have, any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Complainant holds prior rights in the SONNETI trademark, which has been registered and used for many years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

Likewise, it does not appear that the Respondent made nor is making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant demonstrated that the disputed domain name resolves to an active page displaying images seemingly taken from the Complainant's official website, including photographs of its models and products, together with what appear to be fabricated customer reviews. The overall presentation of the site suggests an affiliation or endorsement by JD Sports or its SONNETI trademark, notwithstanding the presence of a disclaimer at the bottom of the page (which seems to have been added at a later stage in this proceeding), which does not alter the misleading nature of the disputed domain name nor the manner in which the Respondent has reproduced the Complainant's content.

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.

The Complainant has stated that the Respondent has repeatedly attempted to evade enforcement efforts throughout 2025. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name was successfully taken down twice during the year, but each time the Respondent re-registered or reactivated the site through a different registrar. Specifically, the Complainant reports that the disputed domain name was first registered with the registrar Name.com and removed on 2 January 2, 2025; subsequently, on March 26, 2025 the same site reappeared under BizCN, where it was taken down again on April 20, 2025; thereafter, the site resurfaced under a third registrar, Dynadot, which informed that the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) was the appropriate escalation mechanism.

Moreover, the Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the SONNETI trademark—owned and commercially operated by JD Sports—is widely known internationally and has been used extensively in commerce for many years prior to the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. By registering the disputed domain name <sonnetilondon.com>, the Respondent has intentionally targeted the Complainant’s well-established SONNETI trademark. The domain redirects users to a webpage using the designation “sonnetilondon” a term that further increases the likelihood of confusion, as the Complainant’s SONNETI brand is closely associated with the UK, where JD Sports operates a large number of physical stores and maintains its strongest market presence. The website reproduces images, promotional materials, and product displays identical to those used by JD Sports, creating the false impression that the site forms part of, or is officially connected with, JD Sports or its SONNETI brand. The site also displays what appear to be fabricated customer reviews and offers goods identical to those sold by the Complainant, reinforcing the impersonation. Although a disclaimer appears at the bottom of the page, this does not negate the overall presentation of the site, which is designed to mimic the Complainant’s official platforms and to mislead users as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the content.

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and of the Complainant’s SONNETI trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Consistent with section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the Panel considers that the inclusion of the Complainant’s SONNETI trademark in the disputed domain name gives rise to a presumption that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent’s impersonation of the Complainant serves two apparent purposes. First, such conduct is directed at disrupting the Complainant’s business, as contemplated under paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, by diverting consumers away from the Complainant’s legitimate online channels, misleading them into believing that the Respondent’s website is an official or dedicated platform for the SONNETI brand, and thereby interfering with the Complainant’s commercial activity, customer trust, and brand reputation.

Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In particular, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves displays pop-up advertisements functioning as affiliate links to external sites, collects user information through cookie settings, and purports to offer SONNETI-branded products for sale, activities which the Panel interprets as efforts to monetize traffic generated through consumer confusion, even though the website includes a disclaimer at the bottom.

Lastly, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed 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 <sonnetilondon.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Iris Quadrio/*

**Iris Quadrio**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 25, 2025