

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Charles & Keith International Pte. Ltd. v. 李斌 (Bin Li / BinLi)
Case No. D2025-4684

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Charles & Keith International Pte. Ltd., Singapore, represented by Strategic IP Information Pte Ltd., Singapore.

The Respondent is 李斌 (Bin Li / BinLi), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <charleskeithksa.com> is registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 12, 2025. On November 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 13, 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 14, 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 Complaints in English on November 19 and 26, 2025.

On November 14, 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 19, 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 Complaints 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Tao Sun as the sole panelist in this matter on December 26, 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, incorporated in 2005, is a Singapore-based company which manufactures and retails footwear, bags and fashion accessories globally and online through its website "www.charleskeith.com". The Complainant has extensively used the CHARLES & KEITH trademark worldwide.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following registered trademarks:

- (i) The European Union registration No. 004520672 CHARLES & KEITH in international classes 14, 18 and 25, registered on July 3, 2006;
- (ii) The international registration No. 1070666 CHARLES & KEITH in international classes 9, 14, 18, 25 and 35, registered on December 17, 2010, designating various jurisdictions including China; and
- (iii) The Chinese registration No. 3216115 CHARLES & KEITH in international class 25, registered on January 14, 2004.

The Complainant also promotes and advertises its products on its website at "www.charleskeith.com", which shows prominent use of the CHARLES & KEITH mark in connection with the Complainant's products.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 12, 2025. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name is resolved to a website which promotes and sells bags and shoes. On this website, the CHARLES & KEITH mark is prominently displayed in the top middle position of the webpages, the photos of CHARLES & KEITH stores are presented, and there is also a copyright statement of "Copyright © 2025 charleskeithksa Powered By charleskeithksa.com". The currency code shown in the website is SAR, which stands for Saudi Arabia Riyal.

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:

- (i) The disputed domain name reproduces the distinctive part of the Complainant's well-known trademark and corporate name CHARLES & KEITH;
- (ii) The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the CHARLES & KEITH trademark or trade name, neither in whole nor in part, in any manner whatsoever, including as a domain name. The use of CHARLES & KEITH as a part of the disputed domain name is mala fide and solely intended towards portraying the disputed domain name as associated with, or related to the Complainant, its products and

activity. As such, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) The Respondent, who has no relationship whatsoever with the Complainant and is using the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark, has clearly registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent's bad faith in registering the disputed domain name is further evidenced in the fact that the website to which it directs contains suggestive images of CHARLES & KEITH products, as an attempt to have the website associated with or endorsed by the Complainant. There can be no doubt that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's mark and trade name when the disputed domain name was chosen and registered well after the Complainant's lengthy and worldwide use of the trademark and trade name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issues: 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 proceeding in Chinese would impose a substantial financial burden and cause undue delay in resolving this matter, and English is widely recognized as the international language of commerce and domain name disputes, ensuring efficiency and fairness in these proceedings.

The Respondent did not make any 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, and noting that the disputed domain name resolves to a website in English, the Center sent the emails in Chinese and English regarding the notification of the Complaint which includes information on the language of the proceeding, the Respondent did not make any comments on the language of the proceeding, and did not file any response, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 disputed domain name contains the Complainant's CHARLES & KEITH mark with the omission of the ampersand "&". The Complainant's mark can be easily recognized within the disputed domain name. Therefore, the disputed domain name should be considered confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other letters may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of "ksa" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's 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 Complainant has asserted that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the CHARLES & KEITH mark or trade name, neither in whole nor in part, in any manner whatsoever, including as a domain name. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name is resolved to a website offering for sale bags and shoes with prominent CHARLES & KEITH trademark and the copyright statement. Considering the reputation of the Complainant's CHARLES & KEITH mark, such uses of the disputed domain name will inevitably mislead Internet users to believe that the website is operated by or at least associated with the Complainant in Saudi Arabia and therefore does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.

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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel therefore 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 Complainant's CHARLES & KEITH mark is inherently distinctive and has been widely promoted and used by the Complainant. The disputed domain name contains the entirety of the Complainant's mark with the addition of "ksa" which can be easily identified as the abbreviation of

“the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia” especially when the website uses the currency code of Saudi Arabia Riyal. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s famous mark and were registered by the Respondent who has no relationship with the Complainant, which can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Furthermore, the facts that the disputed domain name is resolved to a website offering for sale of bags and shoes, where the Complainant’s CHARLES & KEITH trademark is prominently used with the copyright statement, demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s famous trademark and attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark. Such use undoubtedly constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The facts that the Respondent’s failure to respond to this Complaint also support a finding of bad faith.

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 <charleskeithksa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tao Sun/

Tao Sun

Sole Panelist

Date: January 9, 2026