

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Albion Saddlemakers Company Limited v. dahui yang
Case No. D2025-4286

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Albion Saddlemakers Company Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Lim Group, France.

The Respondent is dahui yang, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <albionsaddlemakers.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 October 20, 2025. On October 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 23, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 27, 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 28, 2025 and then filed an amended Complaint on November 3, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and 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 November 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on December 11, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a British company specializing in the design, manufacture, and worldwide sale of high-end equestrian saddles and related equipment. The Complainant's products are distributed internationally through a network of authorized retailers under the brand ALBION.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of various trademarks for ALBION, including, but not limited to the following:

- European Union Trade Mark ALBION No. 002899086, registered on December 9, 2004, for goods in International Classes 18 and 25; and
- United States trademark ALBION No. 3026407, registered on December 13, 2005, for goods in International Class 18.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <albionsaddlemakers.co.uk> which it uses for the online promotion and sale of its products.

There is no information known about the Respondent apart from the details as they appear on the Whois record.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 11, 2025 and resolves to a website impersonating the Complainant and also displaying links to explicit adult content.

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 reproduces in full the Complainant's registered trademark ALBION, followed by the term "saddlemakers", which directly describes the Complainant's business activity. This composition creates a strong likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's brand, suggesting a false connection or official affiliation.

As regards the second element, the Complainant argues that it has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the ALBION mark or any variation thereof. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name "albion saddlemakers" and is not making a bona fide or noncommercial use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the disputed domain name resolves to a website containing pornographic and AI-generated sexual content, which is incompatible with any legitimate business interest and tarnishes the Complainant's brand reputation.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's well-established brand and business. The structure of the disputed domain name mirrors exactly the Complainant's trade name and website address at the domain name <albionsaddlemakers.co.uk>, which shows intentional targeting of the Complainant. The use of the domain name to host pornographic content demonstrates an intent to tarnish the Complainant's reputation,

an attempt to divert Internet users for commercial or malicious purposes and a clear case of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. The Center has employed the required measures to achieve actual notice of the Complaint to the Respondent, in compliance with the Rules, paragraph 2(a), and the Respondent was given a fair opportunity to present its case. Accordingly, the Panel considers it can proceed to determine the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant as per paragraph 15(a) of the Rules. The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that it has rights to a trademark, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark. This first element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark ALBION for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

As regards the second limb of the first element, the test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. It is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") may be ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark as they are viewed as a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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 (here, "saddle" and "makers") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

There is no evidence showing that the Respondent holds any rights for ALBION trademarks. The Panel also notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent is authorized or licensed to use the trademark ALBION. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does the Respondent appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy. The fact that the disputed domain name resolves to a website impersonating the Complainant, displaying its trademark with no disclaimer as to the relationship or lack thereof with the Complainant and also containing links to adult content does not indicate any legitimate interest. The Panel considers that such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant’s contentions, claiming any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Further, the Panel notes that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant (see section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

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.

Since the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, and in light of the use to which the Respondent has put the disputed domain name impersonating the Complainant, and displaying its trademark on the website at the disputed domain name, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the ALBION mark in mind when it registered the disputed domain name. In addition, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's domain name <albionsaddlemakers.co.uk>, apart from the gTLD.

As regards the use of the disputed domain name, from the uncontested evidence in the case file, it results that the disputed domain name is used for a website that displays the Complainant's trademark, impersonating the Complainant, and also including links to explicit adult content. Such use of the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, is likely to unduly profit from the value of the Complainant's trademark and may result in its tarnishing. Such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy as use of the disputed domain name to disrupt the Complainant's business, and also within paragraph 4(b)(iv) as attracting Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

The bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name are also affirmed by the fact that the Respondent did not respond, nor has it denied the assertions of bad faith made by the Complainant in this proceeding. Also, the Respondent seems to have provided false physical address details in the Whois. This is also an indicator of bad faith (section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)).

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 <albionsaddlemakers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025