

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VKR Holding A/S v. sanhong yan

Case No. D2025-4836

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VKR Holding A/S, Denmark, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is sanhong yan, China.

2. The Disputed Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <thevellux.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 20, 2025. On November 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On November 28, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 1, 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 3, 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 December 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on January 9, 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, VKR Holding A/S, based in Denmark, is the parent company of the VELUX Group. Through its subsidiaries, the Complainant offers goods such as roof windows, skylights, vertical windows and systems, thermal solar energy systems, decoration and sun screening products, ventilation, and indoor climate products.

Mr. Villum Kann Rasmussen established the Complainant in 1941, and patented his first roof window in 1942. He called it "Velux" deriving from: "VE", from the word "ventilation" and "lux", from the Latin word for "light".

Currently, the Complainant employs a total of 12,000 people in 37 countries, and in 2024 it reported approximately DKK 28.8 billion in revenue.

The Complainant, directly or through affiliates, holds trademark rights for VELUX in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, such as the following:

- the European Union trademark registration number 000955609 for VELUX (word), filed on October 14, 1998, registered on March 31, 2000, and covering goods in International Classes 6, 7, 9, and 11;
- the International trademark registration number 928560 for VELUX (figurative), registered on March 28, 2007, designating many jurisdictions worldwide including China, and covering goods and services in International Classes 19, 20, 24, and 37; and
- the United States of America ("US") trademark registration number 1091446 for VELUX (word), filed on October 25, 1977, registered on May 16, 1978, covering goods in International Class 19.

The Complainant conducts its online business from the domain name <velux.com> registered on April 19, 1999.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on April 29, 2025, and, at the time of filing of the Complaint, it redirected to a commercial website promoting an array of blankets, and also listing under the Contact Us Page the address of the Complainant's US office. No disclaimer was displayed on the homepage of the website at the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant send a Cease-and-Desist letter to the Respondent's on October 9, 2025. No response was received.

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 VELUX trademark is well-known, and the term "velux" was coined by the Complainant's founder, making the VELUX trademark a distinguishable and unique identifier of the Complainant; the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark because it is capturing a

purposeful misspelling of the VELUX trademark with an additional generic term, “the” at the beginning of the trademark; the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, mainly because: (i) the Complainant has over 80 years of history and its VELUX trademark is known internationally and continues to be the market leader in the manufacturing of skylights and roof windows, which demonstrates the Complainant’s fame, while the Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Name occurred much later, on April 29, 2025; (ii) it must be held that the Respondent has intentionally misappropriated the Complainant’s trademark as a way of redirecting Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Disputed Domain Name’s website; (iii) registration of domain names containing well-known trademarks constitutes bad faith per se because the term “velux” was coined by the Complainant’s founder, making the VELUX trademark a distinguishable and unique identifier; (iv) the Respondent has intentionally misappropriated the Complainant’s trademark as a way of redirecting Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Disputed Domain Name’s website; (v) the address advertised on the Contact Us page on the Disputed Domain Name is in fact the address of the Complainant’s US office, and the Respondent’s addition of the Complainant’s address on its website has led to an influx of inquiries at the Complainant’s address concerning the blankets offered on the Disputed Domain Name which has become disruptive to the Complainant’s business; (vi) the use of privacy service and the lack of response to the Complainant’s Cease-and-Desist letter.

B. Respondent

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

6. 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. 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”, and the obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark, i.e. doubling the letter “l” in the trademark VELUX, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of one term, respectively such alteration, 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](#), sections 1.8. and 1.9.

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 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.

The Panel notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates the Complainant’s mark (with a minor obvious alteration) together with a dictionary non-distinctive term, “the”, corroborated with the featuring of the Complainant’s US address in the content of the website at the Disputed Domain Name, may cause consumer confusion.

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, its trademark and products, particularly because the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark slightly altered and a non-distinctive term, and the registration of the VELUX trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by more than 47 years and is distinctive and well-known worldwide.

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.

Given that the website operated under the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates the Complainant’s mark and a dictionary term, displays the Complainant’s official address in the US without no disclaimer, indeed in this Panel’s view, the Respondent has intended to attract Internet users accessing the website corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name who may be confused and believe that such website is held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated with or related to the Complainant, for the Respondent’s commercial

gain.

Previous UDRP panels have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith for the purpose of Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0.](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, the Respondent failed to provide a response to the present procedures and to the Complainant's letter, and the physical address listed in the Whois was inaccurate or incomplete. Along with other circumstances in this case, such facts constitute further signs 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, <thevellux.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu /

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026