

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Portland Leather Goods, Inc. v. cynthia parker
Case No. D2025-4862

1. The Parties

Complainant is Portland Leather Goods, Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, United States.

Respondent is cynthia parker, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <portlandleatherstore.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 21, 2025. On November 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On November 25, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 25, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on November 25, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 16, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on December 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Harrie R. Samaras as the sole panelist in this matter on December 26, 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

Complainant was founded in 2017 as Portland Leather LLC, a purveyor of leather goods, and on June 5, 2024, Complainant changed its name to Portland Leather Goods, Inc. Complainant owns U.S. Trademark Registration No. 6,855,612 (registered September 27, 2022) for the PORTLAND LEATHER Mark or the "Mark", and 6,693,622 (registered April 5, 2022) for the PORTLAND LEATHER GOODS Mark.

Complainant has three brick and mortar store locations in Oregon and Texas in addition to its primary online presence at "www.portlandleathergoods.com" ("Complainant's Website"), the latter of which it has operated since 2015.

Complainant has been recognized for its leather goods, for example, in Fashion Week Daily, printed on February 24, 2023 entitled "Why Portland Leather Goods Has Become America's Favorite Leather Goods Brand" and in Retail Boss dated September 1, 2023 entitled "From Garage to \$100 Million in Sales: The Story of Portland Leather Goods". Also, Complainant was named within the Top 100 Digital Growth Companies for 2022 by SimilarWeb. In 2025, Travel + Leisure magazine rated Complainant's Oversized Leather Tote Bag as the year's Best Lightweight bag.

The Domain Name was registered on December 27, 2024. It resolves to a website (the "Website") having the following features: (1) it is organized the same way as Complainant's website (i.e., tabs for Leather Bags, Womens, Mens, Small Goods, Almost Perfect Sale, Holiday Deals); (2) Tote Mystery Box and Mini Mystery Box, which Complainant uses on its website along with the same photographs that Complainant uses on its website; (3) it is using Complainant's images and product names to sell the same or similar products that Complainant sells on its website (e.g., Sydney Sling Bag, Cypress Side Bag, Poppy Purse, Circle Crossbody, Lola Zipper Crossbody, Metro Crossbody, Roswell Pouch, Seashell Pouch, Taco Tassel Pouch, and Sidekick Pouch); (4) font size and type for text that looks the same as the text on Complainant's website; (5) product descriptions are the same as on Complainant's Website; (6) the PORTLAND LEATHER Mark is used prominently on the Website like Complainant uses the Mark on its website; (7) Quick Links that are similar to the ones on Complainant's website; and (8) there is a colored banner at the top of both websites calling attention to information of interest to customers (e.g., sale, free shipping).

Early in 2025, Complainant learned that Respondent was using the Domain Name to pose as Complainant to sell leather goods purporting to originate from Complainant. On or about November 19, 2025, Complainant's counsel sent a cease-and-desist letter to Respondent but Complainant has not received any response to it. On or about that same date Complainant's counsel sent the Registrar a letter notifying it, among other things, of trademark infringement and Respondent's impersonation, which the Registrar confirmed receiving. Also, around November 19, 2025, Complainant's counsel submitted an online takedown request to the Domain Name's web host, notifying it, among other things, that the Website was impersonating Claimant's website with supporting details. The web host disabled the Website and it remains disabled.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. Notably, Complainant contends:

It has continuously and exclusively used the PORTLAND LEATHER Mark to advertise its leather goods since it began preparing to do business in 2016. The Domain Name incorporates the first two terms of the PORTLAND LEATHER GOODS Mark deleting the term “goods” and replacing it with the generic term “store” and adding the generic top-level domain name indicator “.com.” Deleting “goods” and adding the generic term “store” does not distinguish the Domain Name sufficiently to avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

Respondent is not a representative of Complainant, does not have a license to use the Mark, and is not authorized by Complainant to register any domain name incorporating the Mark. Likewise, Complainant is not aware of any evidence demonstrating that Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name. Upon information and belief, Respondent has not used or made demonstrable preparations to use the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services nor has it made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. Rather, Respondent appears to have been using the Domain Name to impersonate Complainant for the purpose of purporting to sell leather goods that originate from Complainant when they do not.

Given Respondent’s apparent actual knowledge of Complainant (based on its copycat website), Respondent’s lack of legitimate interest in the PORTLAND LEATHER GOODS and PORTLAND LEATHER Marks, the fact that Respondent used the Domain Name to impersonate Complainant, and that fact that it used Complainant’s Marks and product listing photos to advertise and sell products purporting to originate from Complainant when they do not, it is evident that Respondent registered the Domain Name with an intent of attracting, for commercial gain, Internet users by using the Marks and Website to create a likelihood of confusion with Complainant and the Mark.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

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 PORTLAND LEATHER Mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to it 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 Domain Name and the PORTLAND LEATHER 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the 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 as applicable to this case: impersonation/passing off, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent: (1) registered the Domain Name many years after Complainant began using the PORTLAND LEATHER Mark; (2) registered a Domain Name incorporating the entirety of the Mark simply adding the descriptive term “store”, which does not distinguish the Domain Name from the Mark and only adds to any confusion as it reflects one of the ways Complainant does business; (3) does not have rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (4) has been using the Domain Name on a website which, as described above, replicates Complainant's website in multiple ways. Accordingly, the Panel finds Respondent knew of Complainant and its rights in the PORTLAND LEATHER Mark when registering the Domain Name. Moreover, Respondent was using the Domain Name to gain commercially – sell goods that looked like Complainant's – thus, engaging in bad faith conduct.

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.

Early in 2025, Complainant learned that Respondent was using the Domain Name on the Website as described above. On or about November 19, 2025, Complainant's counsel sent a cease-and-desist letter to Respondent yet Complainant did not respond to it or Complainant's successful efforts to take-down the Website.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 Name <portlandleatherstore.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Harrie R. Samaras/

Harrie R. Samaras

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026