

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Acer Incorporated v. silvercr stuk1
Case No. D2025-5174

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Acer Incorporated, Taiwan Province of China, represented by Cohausz & Florack Patent-und Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaftsgesellschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is silvercr stuk1, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <packardbellstore.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 December 11, 2025. On December 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 12, 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 (Unknown Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 12, 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 12, 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 proceeding commenced on December 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on January 16, 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a company incorporated in Taiwan Province of China, providing a wide range of computer related products and accessories to customers worldwide under the trade mark PACKARD BELL (the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant is the owner of registrations in jurisdictions worldwide for the Trade Mark, including European Union registration No. 018623163, with a registration date of September 13, 2022; and United Kingdom registration No. UK00003734854, with a registration date of May 27, 2022.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is reportedly an individual located in China.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was registered on September 19, 2025.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was previously resolved to an English language website, prominently featuring the Trade Mark and the slogan "Welcome to Packard Bell", featuring images of the Complainant's products, and purportedly offering the Complainant's products via links to the Amazon online sales platform (the "Website").

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name is no longer resolved to an active website.

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 Website is being used to host offers for the Complainant's products containing links to the Amazon sales platform for such products; that the contact information on the Website is unclear – featuring a United States of America telephone number, a United Kingdom address, and a Hotmail email address; and that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in order to opportunistically exploit the Complainant's rights in the Trade Mark.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 trade mark 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 the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks 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 terms 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (here, as applicable to this case: apparent 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. In this regard, the Panel notes in particular on the fact that the Website suggests that it is affiliated with the Complainant by using the Trade Mark and images of the Complainant's products.

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.

The Complainant has rights in the Trade Mark, established long before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's Trade Mark when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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

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 <packardbellstore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: January 30, 2026