

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

OKA Direct Limited v. power ranger  
Case No. D2025-4813

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is OKA Direct Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Gateley Legal, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is power ranger, Cambodia.

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

The disputed domain names <oka-bid.com>, <oka-furniture.com>, and <oka-platform.com> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 19, 2025 regarding <oka-furniture.com> and <oka-platform.com>. On November 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with <oka-furniture.com> and <oka-platform.com>. On November 20, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for <oka-furniture.com> and <oka-platform.com> which differed from the named Respondent (PrivacyGuardian.org llc) and contact information in the Complaint. 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 28, 2025.

On November 26, 2025, the Complainant sent an email requesting the addition of the Domain Name <oka-bid.com>. On December 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the additional Domain Name <oka-bid.com>. On December 2, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name <oka-bid.com>. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 8, 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 16, 2025.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Gregor Vos as the sole panelist in this matter on January 23, 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. Factual Background**

The Complainant is a furniture and home accessories retailer operating in the United Kingdom under the brand OKA. The Complainant was established in 1999 and currently employs over 200 people. The Complainant generated turnover of over GBP 36 million in its 2024/2025 financial year.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <oka.com> and operates a website at this domain name to promote its products.

The Complainant is the owner of inter alia the following trademark registrations (hereinafter referred to as the “Trademarks”):

- Canada Trademark registration No. TMA981329 for OKA, registered on September 25, 2017; and
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00002338998 for OKA registered on June 16, 2006.

The Domain Names were registered on September 27, 2025. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names resolved to identical websites, reproducing a photograph of the Complainant’s products and the Complainant’s Trademark, and requiring a mobile number and a password to sign in. Currently, the Domain Names do not resolve to any active websites.

#### **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 Domain Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are identical and confusingly similar to the Trademarks of the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names, and the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Firstly, according to the Complainant, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to its Trademarks. The Domain Names incorporate the Trademarks in their entirety, with the addition of descriptive terms relating to the Complainant’s products and services, namely “furniture” in <oka-furniture.com>, “bid” in <oka-bid.com>, and “platform” in <oka-platform.com>. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trademarks.

Secondly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. There is no evidence that the Respondent used, or made demonstrable preparations

to use, the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's business and deliberately registered the Domain Names incorporating the Trademarks together with descriptive terms, with the intention of misleading Internet users into believing that the Domain Names are affiliated or otherwise associated with the Complainant. This has been evidenced by the email communications received from certain customers by the Complainant who have incorrectly assumed that one of the Domain Names <oka-furniture.com> belongs to the Complainant. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent reproduced the Complainant's photographs on the websites to which the Domain Names resolved and sought to obtain users' login details. This is inconsistent with any bona fide offering of goods and services. In light of the foregoing, the Complainant submits that the Domain Names were registered and being used in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

For the Complainant to succeed, it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

- i. the Domain Names are 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 Domain Names; and
- iii. the Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Only if all three elements have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedies requested by the Complainant. The Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

### **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 Trademarks and the Domain Names. 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 entirety of the Trademarks is reproduced within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Domain Name <oka-furniture.com> contains the Trademarks, followed by a hyphen and the descriptive term "furniture". The Domain Name <oka-bid.com> contains the Trademarks, followed by a hyphen and the descriptive term "bid". The Domain Name <oka-platform.com> contains the Trademarks, followed by a hyphen and the descriptive term "platform". Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Trademarks 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 Domain Names. 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 Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In this case, the composition of the Domain Names carries a risk of implied affiliation. The Domain Names fully incorporate the Trademarks with the addition of descriptive terms connected to the Complainant’s activities. The Domain Names previously resolved to identical websites that displayed a login interface and a photograph of the Complainant’s products and the Complainant’s Trademark, without disclosing the lack of a relationship with the Complainant. This creates the false impression that they are affiliated with, endorsed by, or authorized by the Complainant. The Panel finds that such use does not confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

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.

With respect to all the Domain Names, the Complainant’s rights to the Trademarks predate the registration of the Domain Names. Considering that each of the Domain Names incorporates the Trademarks in their entirety, with the mere addition of a hyphen and the descriptive terms “platform”, “bid”, and “furniture”, which are frequently connected to the Complainant’s business, as well as the content of the websites to which the Domain Names resolved, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that it is not conceivable that the Respondent chose the Domain Names without knowledge of the Complainant, its activities, and the Trademarks under which the Complainant is doing business.

Furthermore, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that that the Respondent registered the Domain Names with the intention of misleading Internet users into believing that the Domain Names are affiliated with, endorsed by, or otherwise associated with the Complainant. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Names resolved to identical websites that reproduced a photograph of the Complainant’s products

and the Complainant's Trademark, and displayed login and sign-up interfaces, thereby creating a false impression of an official connection with the Complainant. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites.

The fact that the websites sought to obtain users' login details, including mobile phone numbers and passwords, before granting access to any substantive content further supports a finding that the Domain Names were not used in good faith as this could be an indication of phishing activities.

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 Domain Names <oka-bid.com>, <oka-furniture.com>, and <oka-platform.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gregor Vos/*

**Gregor Vos**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 6, 2026