

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

HNI Technologies, Inc. v. Amarii Stevens, bikllsjames kills  
Case No. D2025-4864

### 1. The Parties

Complainant is HNI Technologies, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, United States.

Respondents are Amarii Stevens, United States and bikllsjames kills, United States.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <hniworkplacefumishings.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. The disputed domain name <hniworkplacefurnisshings.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (NameCheap, Inc. and NameSilo, LLC are collectively referred to as the “Registrars”).

### 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 Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 24 and 25, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Privacy User #aa827e80, See PrivacyGuardian.org and Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 26, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on the same day.

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 December 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 31, 2025. On December 16, 17 and 22, 2025, a third party sent email communications to the Center. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on January 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Georges Nahitchevansky as the sole panelist in this matter on January 21, 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**

Complainant, HNI Technologies, Inc., is affiliated with HNI Corporation, a manufacturer of office furniture and hearth products. Complainant appears to support research and development activities related to new product and process development. Complainant and its affiliates own and use the marks HNI and HNI formatives, such as HNI GLOBAL, as a house mark in connection with their products and services. Complainant owns, *inter alia*, registrations for the HNI mark in (i) the European Union (No. 006441836) that issued to registration on October 23, 2008, (ii) the United Kingdom (No. UK00906441836) that issued to registration on October 23, 2008, and (iii) Brazil (No. 831139951) that issued to registration on July 19, 2016. Complainant also owns a registration for HNI GLOBAL in the United States (No. 6,267,988) that issued to registration on February 9, 2021.<sup>1</sup>

Complainant uses the domain name <hnitechservices.com> for a website concerning Complainant and its services, and HNI Corporation uses the domain name <hnicorp.com> for a website concerning HNI Corporation and its products and services. Complainant and its affiliates also own the domain name <hniworkplacefurnishings.com> which redirects to the website at <hnicorp.com>.

The disputed domain names look to have been registered by the Respondents on May 7, 2025 (<hniworkplacefurnishings.com>) and June 30, 2025 (<hniworkplacefurnishings.com>). The <hniworkplacefurnishings.com> disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website or page and resolves to a Registrar “Whois verification is pending” page. The <hniworkplacefurnishings.com> disputed domain name resolves to a pay-per-click (PPC) page. The disputed domain names appear to have been set up for email use.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, Complainant maintains that it has strong rights in the HNI mark by virtue of its use of such as a house-mark since 2004 and through its many trademark registrations for HNI in jurisdictions around the world.

Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its HNI marks as they each fully incorporate the distinctive HNI mark “with typos and homograph spoofs of the term ‘furnishings’ and ‘furnisshings’.”

---

<sup>1</sup> HNI Corporation also owns a number of trademark registrations for the HNI mark alone in such jurisdictions as, by way of example, China (No. 5570285 that issued to registration on September 7, 2009), Hong Kong, China (No. 300707599 that issued to registration on February 1, 2007), and India (No. 1505878 that issued to registration on November 20, 2006).

Complainant argues that Respondents do not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names as Respondents (i) are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, (ii) have not been authorized by Complainant to use the HNI mark, and (iii) have not made any legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. In that regard, Complainant notes that the disputed domain names have not been used for an active website or page, but have been set up for email use.

Lastly, Complainant contends that Respondents have registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith as they fully and prominently incorporate the HNI mark with typo versions of the descriptive terms “workplace furnishings” the exact products for which the Complainant’s HNI mark is known. Complainant also argues that Respondents’ bad faith is shown by Respondents’ lack of use of the disputed domain names and by having set up both disputed domain names for email use.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions. On December 16, 17 and 22, 2025, however, a third party had communications with the Center and Complainant advising that it had received a copy of the Complaint at its physical address but had no connection to either disputed domain name at issue. From the communications it appears that the third party’s address had been fraudulently used as the underlying address for the <hniworkplacefurnishings.com> disputed domain name.

## **6. Preliminary Issue Regarding the Request for Consolidation of Respondents**

The Complaint and its amendment were filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

In determining whether a single consolidated complaint can be brought against multiple respondents, panels typically look at whether (i) the disputed domain names or the corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. See section 4.11.2, Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”).

Based on the evidence submitted, which is not contested by Respondents, the Panel accepts Complainant’s contention that the disputed domain names are subject to common control. The disputed domain names are both based on the exact textual phrase “HNI Workplace Furnishings” and consists of typo versions of such – with the typos in the word “furnishings.” While the disputed domain names were registered through different Registrars, the registrations were done in close proximity in May and June 2025 and follow the same pattern. The disputed domain names were not used for active websites or pages, but were both set up for email use. Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. (Respondents in this proceeding will hereinafter be referred to collectively as “Respondent” in the singular form.)

## **7. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

## **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Complainant has provided evidence that it owns several trademark registrations for the HNI mark and that such issued to registration well before Respondent registered the disputed domain names.

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 names. *Id.*

Here, the HNI mark is fully incorporated and clearly visible in each of the disputed domain names. Although the addition of typo versions of the descriptive phrase "workplace furnishings" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such elements does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the HNI mark for 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 a 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 that Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Here, the disputed domain names are clearly based on Complainant's HNI mark and name, particularly as the HNI mark is followed by typo versions of the phrase "workplace furnishings," a phrase that relates specifically to the very products sold by Complainant. As such, the disputed domain names are more than likely to be mistakenly seen by consumers as related to Complainant and/or its products and services. Additionally, in view of Respondent's failure to appear in this proceeding to explain its actions, the fact that Respondent has set up the disputed domain names for email purposes suggests that Respondent may be attempting to use the disputed domain names that are based on Complainant's HNI mark for Respondent's benefit and possibly a nefarious purpose.

The Panel thus finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for 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 view of Respondent's actions, and failure to appear in this proceeding, it is easy to infer that Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name, which is clearly based on Complainant's HNI mark has been done opportunistically and in bad faith for the benefit or profit of Respondent. The disputed domain names on their face suggest a connection to Complainant and its products and were registered well after Complainant had established rights in its HNI mark. Respondent's bad faith is also underscored by Respondent's registration of typo versions of the phrase "workplace furnishing" which relates specifically to the products of Complainant. Lastly, the fact that Respondent has set up the disputed domain names for email purposes, and has failed to appear to justify its actions, suggests that the disputed domain names were registered for some purpose to benefit Respondent and perhaps a nefarious purpose.

In all, Respondent's actions make it more likely than not that Respondent was fully aware of Complainant and its HNI name and mark when it registered the disputed domain names for Respondent's benefit.

The Panel thus finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

### **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 names <hniworkplacefumishings.com> and <hniworkplacefurnishings.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Georges Nahitchevansky/

**Georges Nahitchevansky**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026