

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

JSP Limited v. Tao Jing

Case No. D2025-4098

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is JSP Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Wynne-Jones IP Limited, UK.

Respondent is Tao Jing, Afghanistan.

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

The disputed domain name <jspcb.info> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 7, 2025. On October 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 9, 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 Complainant on October 20, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 23, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 12, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on November 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on December 1, 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

### A. Complainant

Complainant, JSP Limited, is a company incorporated in the UK. For many years, it has been one of the leading manufacturers and suppliers of personal protective equipment (“PPE”), particularly above-the-neck safety products including head, eye, face and hearing protection. Complainant’s products are marketed and sold worldwide under the JSP brand, which has become highly recognisable and distinctive in the global safety equipment industry.

Complainant has rights in the JSP and JSP-related marks. Complainant is the owner of numerous JSP trademarks worldwide, including the UK trademark registered on December 13, 1999 (the UK Trademark registration number UK00900622035), the European Union (“EU”) trademark registered on December 13, 1999 (the EU Trademark registration number 000622035), and the United States of America (the “USA”) trademark registered on October 10, 2000 (the USA Trademark registration number 2393304) (Annex 6 to the Complaint).

### B. Respondent

Respondent is Tao Jing, Afghanistan.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 4, 2025. According to the Complaint and the evidence provided by Complainant, the disputed domain name was previously resolved to a deceptive website purporting to offer goods and services under the JSP mark and the EVOGUARD mark. Respondent deliberately imitates Complainant’s official website “jspotsafety.co.uk” by using identical images and replicating the overall website layout (Annexes 7 and 8 to the Complaint).

## 5. Parties’ Contentions

### A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s JSP trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the JSP trademark in its entirety. The mere additional letters “cb” do not provide adequate distinction to negate the conclusion that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark JSP.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

### B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Complainant's JSP mark is recognisable 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.

While the additional letters "cb" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the additional letters do 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.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

More specifically:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent has not provided evidence or reasons to justify the choice of the term "jsp", which is the same as Complainant's JSP trademark, in the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the JSP trademark or to register or use any domain name incorporating the JSP marks;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on September 4, 2025, after the JSP mark was registered in the UK (since 1999), the EU (since 1999) and the USA (since 2000). The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's JSP marks; and

(iii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. By contrast, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a deceptive website purporting to offer goods and services under the JSP mark. Respondent deliberately imitates Complainant's official website by using identical images and replicating the overall website layout. Therefore, Respondent has attempted to make profits through the Internet traffic attracted to the website under the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant's trademark.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the information provided by Complainant, the Panel finds that Complainant has a reputation in the JSP marks with regard to its products and services. It is not conceivable that Respondent would not have had Complainant's trademark in mind at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name (in September 2025). This has been reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's JSP trademark entirely, and the use of Complainant's trademark on the website under the disputed domain name.

Respondent has used the website to offer goods and services under the JSP mark. Additionally, Respondent deliberately imitates Complainant's official website by using identical images and replicating the overall website layout. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that Respondent is using a confusingly similar disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 <jspcb.info> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Yijun Tian/  
Yijun Tian  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 2, 2026*