ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
All Star C.V., Converse, Inc. v. Be Inc
Case No. D2025-5187

1. The Parties

The Complainants are All Star C.V. and Converse, Inc., United States of America (the "United States"), represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.[1]

The Respondent is Be Inc, Taiwan Province of China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <converse-tw.com> is registered with Spaceship, 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 12, 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 17, 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 22, 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").

[1] Complainants All Star C.V. and Converse, Inc. will hereinafter be referred in this decision as the "Complainant" unless reference is made individually to any of them.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard C.K. van Oerle as the sole panelist in this matter on February 4, 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 the owner and operator of many famous and globally recognized shoe brands, including but not limited to: CONVERSE, NIKE and AIR-JORDAN. The Complainant has produced and sold shoes for over a century and was founded in 1908 in Massachusetts, United States, as a rubber company. The Complainant contends it began producing shoes in 1909 and, since that time, the Complainant has developed the CONVERSE brand into a famous brand selling footwear, apparel and bags around the world.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for CONVERSE, including United States Registrations Nos. 2,810,717 (registered on February 3, 2004) and 3,175,430 (registered on November 21, 2006), and Taiwan Province of China Trademark Registration No. 01907812, registered April 1, 2018, where the Respondent is apparently located. All registrations have been duly renewed and are still valid. The registrations will jointly be referred to, in singular, as the "Trademark".

Prior decisions under the Policy have recognized the worldwide reputation and well known character of the CONVERSE Trademark,[2] as well as its famous character. With reference to the famous character of the CONVERSE Trademark, *Converse Inc. v. Perkins Hosting*, WIPO Case No. D2005-0350 indicated "[i]t can fairly be inferred that registration and use of the Domain Name […] comprised of a famous mark [CONVERSE] and a relevant descriptive word, was a bad-faith effort to confuse Internet users. […]".

The Complainant operates an official website for the CONVERSE brand, which is available at "www.converse.com".

The disputed domain name was first registered on June 30, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website offering shoes branded as the Complainant's for sale. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive 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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark because it incorporates the Trademark in its entirety, with only the addition of a hyphen and the term "tw".

---

[2] See *All Star C.V. v. George*, WIPO Case No. D2018-0414; *All Star C.V. and Converse, Inc. v. Client Care, Web Commerce Communications Limited*, WIPO Case No. D2022-3487; *All Star C.V. v. Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2020-0938; *All Star C.V. v. Baker Barry, Baker Barry*, WIPO Case No. D2020-1132; and *All Star C.V. and Converse, Inc. v. Narendra Ghimire*. WIPO Case No. DCO2024-0014.

This addition is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Trademark because the Trademark remains clearly recognizable, and “tw” is a common geographic abbreviation for Taiwan Province of China.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under the Policy, and is not authorized or affiliated with the Complainant.
Regarding a bona fide offering, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name resolved to an impersonation website copying the CONVERSE brand and offering products at prices far below official retail levels and indicating that the goods were counterfeit.

The Complainant further states that a test purchase in August 2025 confirmed that the product was counterfeit, based on poor quality, improper labeling, and the absence of official direct sales in Taiwan Province of China.

On this basis, it maintains that the Respondent’s conduct cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any similar designation. The Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use, but is instead misleading consumers for commercial gain through unauthorized use of the Trademark and the sale of counterfeit goods. The Respondent has exploited the reputation of the Trademark to divert Internet traffic and deceive consumers for personal or financial benefit.

Finally, the Complainant submits that, even if the goods were genuine, the impersonating nature of the disputed domain name and its unauthorized association with the CONVERSE Trademark demonstrates that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, relying on multiple indicators of intentional misconduct. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name falsely suggests an affiliation with their business by incorporating the Trademark in full and adding “-tw”, which implies an official Taiwanese website. The Complainant states that no such official website exists and that the associated website unlawfully impersonated the CONVERSE Trademark, demonstrating that the Respondent was aware of and deliberately targeted the Complainant and its Trademark. The Complainant emphasizes that the disputed domain name hosted an impersonation website offering counterfeit CONVERSE products, which was confirmed through a test purchase conducted by the Complainant. Using the disputed domain name to sell counterfeit goods constitutes strong evidence of bad faith registration and use, as such conduct implies prior knowledge of the Complainant’s rights and an intention to exploit them.

Based on this, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name intending to deceive consumers and to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion regarding the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and its products.

Accordingly, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith under the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

(i) the disputed domain name is 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 disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondent's default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.3.

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 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 Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "-tw", the common geographic abbreviation for Taiwan Province of China) 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 disputed domain name and the Trademark 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.

The disputed domain name replicates the Trademark in its entirety, with the addition of a hyphen and the additional term "tw", which is the ISO code for and the country code Top-Level Domain of Taiwan Province of China (where the Complainant also operates). The composition of the disputed domain name strongly suggests endorsement by the Complainant and that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its Trademark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed sale of counterfeit goods, and 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.

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.

Section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.0 states that "the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith".

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Trademark is a famous and worldwide known trademark.

On top of that the disputed domain name replicates the Trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the additional term "tw", which is the ISO code for and the country code Top-Level Domain of Taiwan Province of China, which strongly suggests that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its Trademark. Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As discussed above under Section 6.B., the website associated with the disputed domain name imitated the Complainant's website. It prominently displayed the Complainant's stylized logo and copied the look and feel of the Complainant's website. The website also advertised and sold counterfeit CONVERSE goods. The Complainant confirmed this through a test purchase from the Respondent's website. As such, the Respondent's conduct supports the inference that the Respondent intentionally has used the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the impersonating website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the CONVERSE Trademark regarding the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website and products.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off and sale of counterfeit goods, 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 <converse-tw.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Richard C.K. van Oerle/
Richard C.K. van Oerle
Sole Panelist
Date: February 16, 2026