

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Globeride, Inc. v. ping567 Luo

Case No. D2025-4688

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Globeride, Inc., Japan, represented by DLA Piper US LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is ping567 Luo, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <daiwa-store.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 13, 2025. On November 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 24, 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 on November 24, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Christopher J. Pibus as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 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

For nearly 70 years, the Complainant, and its predecessors in title, have manufactured and sold various fishing products under the mark and name DAIWA in the United States and around the world. To protect its trademark rights, the Complainant has obtained trademark registrations for the DAIWA marks in many jurisdictions, including United States Reg. No. 1993056 for the mark DAIWA, dated August 13, 1996 in class 28. The Complaint is based on the Complainant's worldwide trademark registrations for its DAIWA trademark (the "DAIWA Marks").

The first DAIWA branded spinning reel was marketed and sold in 1955. Since that time, the DAIWA brand has grown into one of the largest fishing and tackle companies in the world. The Complainant owns and operates a number of websites under the DAIWA brand at which it advertises, promotes, and sells goods branded under the DAIWA Marks. These websites include "www.daiwa.us", "www.daiwa.com", and "www.daiwachina.com". The DAIWA Marks are also promoted and advertised in connection with the DAIWA PRO TEAM, which is a team of professional anglers who represent the DAIWA brand in professional fishing tournaments. The Complainant's DAIWA brand is recognized as one of the best fishing brands in the world, including being ranked second in the SF Active list of Top 11 Best Brands for Fishing in the World. Due to its promotion and continued global use of its name and brands, the Complainant has built up international goodwill and reputation in the DAIWA trademark among its consumers.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on September 9, 2022, and subsequently created a full website featuring the DAIWA trademarks and branding, including a claim to be the official DAIWA website. The Respondent's website prominently uses the Complainant's registered trademark logo in association with images of the full range of fishing merchandise which look the same or similar to legitimate offerings of 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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name and created a fraudulent website, solely to commit fraud and conduct their illicit scheme, by impersonating the DAIWA business. These actions clearly indicate the Respondent's intentional and bad faith attempts to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's well-known marks and to trade off the goodwill associated with its marks and ".com" domain. The Complainant seeks a finding of bad faith and an order transferring the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

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

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.

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 evidence indicates that the trademark is recognized as a well-known mark, supported by registrations around the world.

The entirety of the DAIWA mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name and the 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](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “- store” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 is not making a legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain. Instead, as described above, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to deceive third parties, by hosting a copycat website including trademarks, logos and branding. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's *prima facie* showing of targeted impersonation 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The evidence clearly demonstrates that the Respondent has created a flagrantly fraudulent website associated with the disputed domain name, replete with unauthorized use of trademarks and branding. The Respondent actually misrepresents itself as "the Daiwa Official Website." Its "Contacts" page has false information about a purported office in Tennessee, which actually appears to be a residential home. When the Complainant attempted to make an online purchase by inputting credit card details it was redirected to a parked page, and no product was ever shipped. These examples are strong indicia of outright fraud, intended to deceive consumers and specifically target the Complainant.

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 <daiwa-store.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christopher J. Pibus/

Christopher J. Pibus

Sole Panelist

Date: January 2, 2026