

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Eaton Corporation v. hong kang

Case No. D2025-5260

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Eaton Corporation, United States of America, represented internally.

The Respondent is hong kang, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <thetriplite.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 16, 2025. On December 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 18, 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 (Dynadot Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 18, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 19, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Philippe Gilliéron as the sole panelist in this matter on January 28, 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**

Trippe Manufacturing Company was founded in 1922 and used the mark TRIPP LITE has been in use in commerce since the 1960s. In 2021, the Complainant's parent company acquired Trippe Manufacturing Company and its portfolio of trademarks which were then transferred to the Complainant.

As a result, the Complainant owns numerous trademarks on a worldwide basis which consist in all or in part of the terms TRIPP LITE such as, for instance, in the United States:

- Verbal trademark n° 1758014, that was registered in classes 9 and 11 on March 16, 1993;
- Verbal trademark n° 2804960, that was registered in class 9 on January 13, 2004;
- Verbal trademark n° 30033858, that was registered in class 9 on October 4, 2005;
- Combined trademark n° 3993102, that was registered in classes 9 and 37 on July 12, 2011;
- Verbal trademark n° 4005405, that was registered in classes 9 and 37 on August 2, 2011.

The Complainant further owns and conducts its online activities through the domain name <tripplite.eaton.com>.

On April 30, 2025, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name leads to a website that displays the Complainant's logo, including the terms TRIPP LITE on numerous accounts. While the website displays numerous products marketed under the trademark TRIPP LITE, none of these products can actually be ordered through the website, which further displays a non-existent address for its claimed headquarters on its contact page as well as a historical section related to the Complainant's history.

#### **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 its trademark as it entirely incorporates the terms TRIPP LITE with the mere addition of the definite article "the", which is not sufficient to dispel the resulting likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant affirms that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. He is not sponsored or legitimately affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant's mark in a domain name or in any other manner. Moreover, the Complainant is not aware of any other entity that is commonly known by TRIPP LITE or uses TRIPP LITE as a trademark. Furthermore, the use made of the disputed domain name by the Respondent as described above cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The Complainant finally is of the view that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is linked to a website that is passing itself off as the Complainant's website, likely in an attempt to obtain personal information from consumers. As a result, the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's rights in the TRIPP LITE trademarks when he registered the disputed domain name, an awareness that is further reflected by the display on the "About Us" page of the website of

the Complainant's history, which appears to be partially incorrect. Such a use of the disputed domain name obviously amounts to a use in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "[...] decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (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.

### **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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms here the definite article "the" 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 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 illegal activity, here the claimed impersonation of the Complainant, 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 the Respondent was obviously aware of the Complainant's trademark when he registered the disputed domain name, as the website associated with the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's logo, including the terms TRIPPLE LITE on numerous instances in an obviously deliberate way. This awareness is further reflected by display of a historical section describing, partly in an incorrect way, the Complainant's history.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here the claimed impersonation of the Complainant, 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 <thetriplite.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Philippe Gilliéron/*

**Philippe Gilliéron**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 29, 2026