

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pure Fishing, Inc. v. Vladimir Veselovskiy
Case No. D2025-4796

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Pure Fishing, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Neal & McDevitt, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Vladimir Veselovskiy, Ukraine.

2. The Disputed Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <thespiderwire.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 18, 2025. On November 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On November 20, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 5, 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 December 9, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 December 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on January 7, 2026. 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. Further Procedural Considerations

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Since the Respondent's mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue. Having considered the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that it should.

The Panel notes that the Center has used the Respondent's email address as registered with the Registrar for the purpose of notifying the Complaint, as well as to the email address of the privacy service listed in the publicly available Whois database, and to the postmaster email address associated with the Disputed Domain Name, as specified by the Rules. There is no evidence that the case notification emails to the first two email addresses were not successfully delivered.

It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no doubt (albeit in the absence of any Response) that the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill in its trademark. The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case so that the administrative proceeding should take place with due expedition. Therefore, the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

5. Factual Background

The Complainant, located in the United States, designs and manufactures fishing tackle equipment and related products.

The Complainant owns trademark rights for SPIDERWIRE, such as the following:

- the United States Trademark Registration number 2035583 for SPIDERWIRE (word), filed on March 7, 1996, registered on February 4, 1997, covering goods in International Class 28; and
- the United States Trademark Registration number 4688284 for SPIDERWIRE (logo), filed on July 1, 2014, registered on February 17, 2015, covering goods in International Class 28.

The Complainant conducts its online activity under the domain name <spiderwire.com>.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on April 15, 2024, and, at the time of filing the Complaint, it was used in relation to a commercial website promoting products similar and identical to those provided by the Complainant, including purported SPIDERWIRE-branded fishing line and tackle, and displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo, as well as product images. Also, on the website under the Disputed Domain Name the Respondent claimed copyright protection and provided the Complainant's address and customer service phone number under the Contact information section.

The Respondent was involved in at least five UDRP disputes decided against it. See *DDP Specialty Electronic Materials US, LLC v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3033](#), and cases cited therein.

6. 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 through the longstanding, widespread and exclusive use of its SPIDERWIRE trademarks throughout the United States and elsewhere, its SPIDERWIRE trademarks have become widely recognized as a leading brand in the fishing industry;

the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to its registered and unregistered trademarks since it incorporates SPIDERWIRE mark in its entirety and the presence of the article "the" in the Disputed Domain Name does not eliminate the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark; the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith mainly because: (i) the SPIDERWIRE trademark is well-known and has a strong reputation in the fishing industry; (ii) the use of the Complainant's contact information on the website at the Disputed Domain Name, makes implausible to believe that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant, its trademarks and <spiderwire.com> domain name when it registered the Disputed Domain Name; (iii) the use of the Disputed Domain Name to offer SPIDERWIRE-branded products using photographs that appear on the Complainant's website, further confirms that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant at the time of registering and during its use of the Disputed Domain Name and that the Respondent's primary purpose of the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name was to divert the Complainant's customers to the Respondent's website; (iv) the Respondent employed a privacy service; and (v) the Respondent has a history of cybersquatting with a pattern of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

7. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (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 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. See 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 Panel finds 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.

While the addition of other term, here “the”, 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 the 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.

According to the evidence, the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a website promoting goods similar to those of the Complainant, displaying the Complainant’s trademark and logo, using the Complainant’s product pictures and official contact information, without providing any disclaimer regarding the relationship (in fact the lack thereof) between the Respondent and the Complainant. UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (such as 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 also notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name itself carries a risk of implied affiliation given that the Complainant’s trademark has been reproduced in the Disputed Domain Name, together with the non-distinctive term “the”. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks particularly since it incorporates the Complainant's mark (registered since 1997) together with the non-distinctive term, "the", and is highly similar to the Complainant's domain name. Further, the use of the Disputed Domain Name reinforces such finding.

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.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Creating a website displaying the Complainant's trademarks and copyrighted images and providing identical and similar goods to those provided by the Complainant under its trademark, as well as the Complainant's official contact details, without providing any disclaimer, in this Panel's view, the Respondent has intended to attract Internet users accessing the website at the Disputed Domain Name who may be confused and believe that the website is held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated or related to the Complainant, for its commercial gain.

The use of a domain name for illegal activity such as claimed impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and it is considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy provides another circumstance of bad faith registration and use when the respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct. The Respondent's involvement in more than five past procedures decided against it enforces such finding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

8. 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, <thespiderwire.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Marilena Comanescu/
Marilena Comanescu
Sole Panelist
Date: January 20, 2026*