

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Massman Companies, Inc. v. 成都谷道科技有限公司
(chengdugudaokejiyouxiangongsi)
Case No. D2025-4541

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Massman Companies, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Lathrop GPM LLP, United States.

The Respondent is 成都谷道科技有限公司 (chengdugudaokejiyouxiangongsi), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <edlmachineco.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 4, 2025. On November 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 5, 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 November 10, 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 in English on November 11, 2025.

On November 10, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On November 11, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Sok Ling MOI as the sole panelist in this matter on December 15, 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 Delaware corporation in the business of providing automated packaging machines and equipment for production lines. According to the short write-up seen on a website screenshot annexed to the Complaint, the Complainant’s EDL brand offers flexible packaging equipment in the shrink wrapping and multi-packing industry. Other than this three-page website screenshot (which also does not show the website url), the Complainant’s representative did not provide any information on the Complainant and its business (such as date of establishment, country, channel and scale of operation) in the Complaint.

The Complainant owns the following trade mark registration in the United States for EDL in respect of packaging machines and related services:

- United States Registration No. 7,460,353 for EDL word mark in Classes 7, 37, 40 and 42, registered on July 30, 2024.

The Complainant claims that it owns the domain name <edlpackaging.com>, but did not provide any further information or evidence of its registration details in the Complaint.

The disputed domain name was registered March 27, 2025, about eight months after the Complainant has registered its EDL trade mark. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves appears to be almost identical to the Complainant’s website and makes reference to 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is a blatant copy of the Complainant’s website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates English descriptive terms ("machine co") and the associated website contents are entirely in English.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issue - Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order for the disputed domain name to be transferred:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark 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.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's EDL trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The addition of the terms "machine" and "co" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and does not impact on the analysis of whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark.

The Panel finds the Complainant's trade mark is recognizable 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](#), sections 1.7 and 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.

The Complainant has confirmed that the Respondent is not in any way affiliated with the Complainant or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the EDL trade mark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating the EDL trade mark. There is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "edl" or has any rights in the term "edl". Instead, the Respondent's website appears to be a blatant copy of the Complainant's website using images of the Complainant's products.

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.

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 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 resolves to a website which appears to be a blatant copy of the Complainant's website and makes reference to the Complainant. This suggests that the

Respondent clearly knew of the Complainant and its business.

By registering the disputed domain name which incorporates the EDL trade mark, the Respondent is attempting to attract Internet users to the Respondent's webpage by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark as to the source of the Respondent's webpage, presumably for commercial gain. The circumstances referred to in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy are applicable.

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 <edlmachineco.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sok Ling MOI/

Sok Ling MOI

Sole Panelist

Date: January 8, 2026