

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Pioneer Veterinary Products Limited v. Jaewan Lee  
Case No. D2025-4692

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Pioneer Veterinary Products Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Briffa Legal Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Jaewan Lee, Republic of Korea.

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

The disputed domain name <pioneervet.com> is registered with Inames Co., Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 12, 2025. The Complaint included a request that English be the language of the proceeding. On the following day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 14, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant, providing the contact details and confirming that the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is in Korean.

The Center verified that the 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 English and Korean, of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center in English on December 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on December 8, 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 supplies veterinary products. It is the registered proprietor of the following trademark registrations for a figurative PIONEER VETERINARY PRODUCTS mark:

- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00002645563, entered on the register on June 7, 2013, specifying goods in class 10; and
- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00002657364, entered on the register on July 26, 2013, specifying services in class 35.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant acquired them by assignment from Pioneer Products UK (a partnership) on March 31, 2018. Pioneer Products UK had also registered the domain name <pioneerpet.co.uk> on November 26, 2008 and been using it in connection with a website providing information about itself and its products. According to archived screenshots provided by the Complainant, the website prominently displayed the Complainant's figurative PIONEER VETERINARY PRODUCTS mark as registered from as early as July 31, 2013. The Complainant acquired the domain name from Pioneer Products UK on January 20, 2016 together with its business and has continued to use the domain name in connection with the website since that time.

The Respondent is an individual based in the Republic of Korea. According to information provided by the Complainant, the Respondent has been respondent in multiple UDRP proceedings. See *Accor SoLuxury HMC v. Jaewan Lee*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0574](#); *New Era Oil (UK) Limited v. Jaewan Lee*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1408](#); *AIDA Cruises - German Branch of Costa Crociere S.p.A. v Jaewan Lee*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-1772](#); *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG v Jaewan Lee*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-3161](#); *Leighton Adem v. Jaewan Lee*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1905](#); *Equifax Inc. v. Jaewan Lee*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1628](#); *Instramed Industria Médico Hospitalar Ltda. v. Jaewan Lee*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0032](#); and *Yper, SAS v 이재완 (jaewan Lee)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4802](#). Most, but not all, of the above panels in these prior UDRP proceedings ordered a transfer of the domain names at issue.

The disputed domain name was created on October 23, 2014. It resolves to a landing page hosted by a domain name broker advertising it for sale. According to a screenshot presented by the Complainant, the broker displays a sale price of GBP 6,084.11.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on September 22, 2025.

#### 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 its predecessor, Pioneer Products UK, commenced trading activity under the mark PIONEER VETERINARY PRODUCTS in 2009. On January 21, 2016, the Complainant was incorporated to take over this business. The mark PIONEER VET has commonly been used by the Complainant and its predecessor since 2009. The Complainant is the proprietor of United Kingdom trademark registrations for a figurative PIONEER VETERINARY PRODUCTS mark as shown in Section 4. This is a well-known mark and the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to it.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. To the best of the Complainant's knowledge and belief, the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page that contains an offer for sale. The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and its registration prevents the Complainant from registering the ".com" equivalent of its primary domain name. The disputed domain name is currently offered for sale for a price of GBP 6,003.30, which is in excess of any foreseeable out-of-pocket expenses. The Complainant's trademarks are distinctive, and well known, and its reputation is such that the Respondent in all likelihood knew or should have known of the existence of its trademarks at the time when the disputed domain name was registered. The incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name by a Registrant having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent requests that the Panel deny all claims made by the Complainant and issue a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

Notably, the Respondent contends that the Complainant does not own any trademark rights in "pioneervet" or "pioneervet.com". The disputed domain name is composed of ordinary dictionary terms. There is no basis to claim confusing similarity.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in October 2014 for legitimate domain investment and future development purposes. Domain investing is internationally recognized as lawful, and numerous UDRP panels have confirmed that registering dictionary word domains is a legitimate business activity.

The Respondent has rights and legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. He had no knowledge of the Complainant at the time of registration. The registration was made solely because "pioneer" + "vet" is a generic and commercially valuable phrase. The disputed domain name has only ever displayed the broker's autogenerated parking page, including automatically generated pricing. The Respondent never contacted the Complainant, never offered the disputed domain name for sale, and never demanded any payment. No intent existed to target, disrupt, or trade on the Complainant's business.

All facts demonstrate the absence of bad faith. The Complainant failed to register the disputed domain name despite having every opportunity. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2014, six years after the Complainant registered its own domain name in 2008. The Complainant then remained silent for a further 11 years. If the Complainant truly believed its rights were violated, it would not have waited more than a decade before taking action. The Respondent never contacted the Complainant, never attempted to sell the disputed domain name, never requested payment, and never created content referring to the Complainant in any way. All pricing visible on the broker's landing page is algorithmically generated by the broker, not by the Respondent. There is zero evidence of bad faith.

The Complaint represents a clear case of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. Reasons include: the Complainant owns no trademarks for "pioneervet" anywhere in the world; the Complainant failed to register the disputed domain name despite having ample opportunity to do so between 2008 and 2014; and the Complainant waited 11 years before raising any dispute. The Complainant is attempting to weaponize the UDRP as a shortcut to forcibly take a domain name that it never owned or had rights to. This constitutes a bad faith abuse of the UDRP process.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding**

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Korean. 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, arguing that the Respondent is able to communicate in English, as evidenced by the fact that the disputed domain name is composed of English words; the Respondent has been party to multiple UDRP proceedings conducted in English, and the Complainant sent its cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent in English.

The Respondent did not make any specific submission with respect to the language of the proceeding but submitted the Response in English.

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 Issues**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (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 burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

### **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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown registered rights in respect of a figurative PIONEER VETERINARY PRODUCTS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant appears to claim unregistered trademark rights in a PIONEER VET mark as well. The evidence in support comprises an archived screenshot of the Complainant's predecessor's website from 2012 showing a single reference to "Pioneer Vet" in fine print in the homepage footer, as well as the incorporation of "pioneervet" in the domain name associated with that website, now operated by the Complainant. This evidence is inadequate to show that PIONEER VET has become a distinctive identifier that consumers associate with the Complainant's goods and services. Accordingly, the Complainant has not shown unregistered trademark rights.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name contains sufficient recognizable elements of the Complainant's registered mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the initial and distinctive textual element of that mark (i.e., "pioneer") and an abbreviation of the second textual element of the mark (i.e., "vet", short for "veterinary"), omitting the descriptive term "products". The disputed domain name contains no additional element besides a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for

the purposes of the Policy. Given that the figurative elements of the mark cannot be reflected in a domain name, these may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity as well. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, 1.10, and 1.11.1.

The Respondent submits that the Complainant does not own any trademark rights in “pioneervet” or “pioneervet.com”. However, in light of the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s registered PIONEER VETERINARY PRODUCTS mark, no other rights are required for the Complaint to satisfy the first element of the Policy. The Respondent also submits that the disputed domain name is composed of ordinary dictionary terms. This issue is considered in relation to the second element of the Policy in Section 6.2B below.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered mark, resolves to a webpage hosted by a domain name broker advertising it for sale for a price over GBP 6,000. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use the disputed domain name, as evidenced by its cease-and-desist letter. In the Panel’s view, these circumstances do not indicate that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is this a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Further, the Registrar has verified that the Respondent’s name is “Jaewan Lee”, which does not resemble the disputed domain name. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

Turning to the Respondent’s arguments, he submits that the disputed domain name is composed of two common dictionary words (i.e., “pioneer” and “vet”). He argues that this combination is descriptive and capable of referring to numerous concepts such as a pioneering expert (“pioneer” + “veteran”), a pioneering veterinary professional, or any individual who is a “vet” in their field. He argues that the terms are highly generic, widely used, and free for anyone to adopt. However, while the Panel notes that “pioneer” and “vet” are both dictionary words, and that “vet” may be an abbreviation of “veterinary”, “veterinarian” or “veteran” (as well as being a verb meaning “to investigate”), the combination of these terms is not a dictionary phrase nor a common phrase. The Respondent has not shown that the combination of these words is used in any of the senses that he suggests, other than as part of the Complainant’s mark, including in the Complainant’s domain name. The Respondent also refers to potential “future development purposes” for the disputed domain name but provides no evidence of any demonstrable preparations to use it in any way different from its current use. Accordingly, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing.

Based on the 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. The first of these circumstances is as follows:

“(i) circumstances indicating that [the Respondent has] registered or [the Respondent has] acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [the Respondent’s] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the [disputed] domain name”.

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2014, after the registration of the Complainant’s PIONEER VETERINARY PRODUCTS trademark in 2013. The disputed domain name incorporates the initial and distinctive textual element of that mark (i.e., “pioneer”) and an abbreviation of the second textual element of the mark (i.e., “vet”, short for “veterinary”), omitting the descriptive term “products”. The mark was already in use online on the website of the Complainant’s predecessor-in-business prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is also identical to the Complainant’s domain name (but for the Secondary-Level Domain extension) that was already used in connection with that website prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. While the Respondent argues that the disputed domain name has various potential meanings, he has not shown that the combination “pioneer” and “vet” is used in any of the senses that he suggests, other than as part of the Complainant’s mark, including in the Complainant’s domain name. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its mark in mind.

As regards use, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage hosted by a domain name broker advertising it for sale for a price over GBP 6,000. It is not disputed that this sum exceeds the Respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name, even when account is taken of 11 years of renewal fees. The Respondent argues that the webpage and price are autogenerated by the broker. However, the offering for sale appears consistent with his statement that he registered the disputed domain name for domain investment. In any case, as the registrant of the disputed domain name, the Respondent is responsible for the use that is made of it, and there is no evidence that he ever instructed the broker to take down the webpage or remove the price. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the circumstances of this case fall within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent argues that the Complainant delayed in initiating this dispute. Indeed, 11 years have passed since the registration of the disputed domain name. However, mere delay neither bars a complainant from filing a case, nor from potentially prevailing on the merits. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.17. Nothing on the record indicates that the Complainant waived its rights under the Policy or acquiesced in the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant was under no obligation to negotiate a purchase of the disputed domain name prior to filing the Complaint.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

### **D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking**

The Respondent requests that the Panel issue a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. The Panel declines to make such a finding; on the contrary, the Panel has upheld the Complaint.

## **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 <pioneervet.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Matthew Kennedy/*

**Matthew Kennedy**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 15, 2025