

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lund Motion Products, Inc. v. Yu Fang
Case No. D2025-5264

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lund Motion Products, Inc., United States of America ("USA"), represented by MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC, USA.

The Respondent is Yu Fang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <theampresearch.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 confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. 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 amended Complaint on December 18, 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 proceedings commenced on January 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman as the sole panelist in this matter on January 27, 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 has designed and marketed a variety of specialized accessories for road vehicle, including "... a vehicle tailgate enclosure for securing cargo within the existing cargo area of a vehicle or over an open tailgate of a vehicle." This item is the subject of the following trademark:

AMP RESEARCH, word mark, United States Patent and Trademark Office, registered on November 6, 2007, registration number 3331472, in class 12. This trademark was assigned to the Complainant on October 4, 2013.

The Complainant uses a logo comprising the large letters "AMP" in a designer typeface, above the word "research" in a more conventional type of the same height.

The Complainant uses domain names for its official website including <ampresearchco.com>.

No background information has been provided by the Respondent except for a name, address, telephone number and email address provided to the Registrar at the time of registration of the disputed domain name on June 18, 2024. The disputed domain name has resolved to a website (the "Respondent's website") leading to various pages promoting the Complainant's products and those of certain competitors that market automotive products similar to the Complainant's products. The Respondent's website pages are headed with a prominent representation of the Complainant's logo, with the string "AMP" appearing to be identical in style to the Complainant's and the word "research" in a smaller typeface, and in small print the URL of the Respondent's website in the form "www.theampresearch.com".

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 identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights. Disregarding the generic Top-Level Directory (TLD) ".com", the only difference from the Complainant's trademark is the prefix of the word "the", which the Complainant submits is insufficient to differentiate the disputed domain name from the relevant trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The first use of the Complainant's trademark predates the disputed domain name by more than two decades. The Respondent is not an authorized distributor or service provider in respect of the Complainant's products. In particular, the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant's products. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is not for any bona fide offering of goods or services but rather trades on the Complainant's trademark and goodwill in order to attract visitors, who are then shown promotional material for the automotive accessories of the companies Westin and Predator, which trade in products functionally similar to and in competition with the Complainant's products.

The Complainant says the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot qualify as fair or noncommercial. There is no evidence the Respondent has been known by the disputed domain name or anything similar.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant says the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark of some two decades standing when registering the disputed domain name, which differs from the trademark only by the prefixed word "the".

The Complainant says that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name to trade intentionally on the Complainant's goodwill. The Respondent has intended to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by causing a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the Complainant's affiliation with, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. The Respondent's website displays a logo similar to the Complainant's trademark AMP RESEARCH (design) that the Complainant says it holds. The Respondent's website contains images and photos the Complainant believes to have been copied from the Complainant's website.

The Complainant has produced a partial list of 1000 domain names out of 1798 that it says are registered with the same Respondent, and says the Respondent engages in a pattern of conduct of the registration of domain names containing third-party trademarks.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 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") 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.

It is noted that the trademark record produced by the Complainant shows a registration date of November 6, 2007, predating the registration date for the disputed domain name of June 18, 2024. The disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's trademark, by displaying the products of the Complainant's competitors Westin and Predator under a heading also featuring the Complainant's trademark, is not in use for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a noncommercial or fair purpose. The Respondent has offered no evidence of having been known by the disputed domain name or similar.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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)(iv) of the Policy reads as follows:

"by using the domain name, you [the Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location."

According to screen captures produced in evidence by the Complainant, the disputed domain name has resolved to various website pages. What appears to be the landing page is prominently headed with a close but inaccurate representation of the Complainant's logo comprising "AMP" in artistic type above "RESEARCH" in more conventional type. On the Respondent's website, the logo also surmounts a small type reference to the URL of the website, incorporating the disputed domain name. The website clearly misrepresents itself as the Complainant, with headings such as "About Amp Research" and "Amp Research Top Products", followed by several pages featuring information and photographs of products identical or similar to the Complainant's products such as vehicle steps that assist access to vehicles having a high road clearance.

Other of the Respondent's website pages, also headed with the same close representation of the Complainant's logo, take several pages to feature the alleged virtues of the "Westin HDX Drop Step", or the "Predator Step Tubes" designed for vehicle accessibility. The page featuring Westin products provides a form in which potential customers may register their interest.

The Panel, in checking evidence as permitted under section 4.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), noted the existence of a considerable number of trademarks comprising or incorporating the string "AMP" belonging variously to companies dealing in electrical items, cables, batteries and amplifiers; others dealing in food and medicines; in fertilizers, educational products, wheelchairs; in plastics, consultancy, insurance and a host of other goods and services.

The incorporation into the Respondent's website of details and photographs of goods identical to or competitively equivalent to those sold by the Complainant leaves no doubt that of the numerous AMP-related trademarks in use worldwide, the Respondent has targeted specifically the Complainant's trademark.

Thus, the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark is being used in such a way as to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website by confusion with the Complainant's trademark, if only initially, with the intention of ultimate commercial gain. On the evidence and on the balance of probabilities the Panel finds the Respondent's activities to be within the contemplation of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and that the disputed domain has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <theampresearch.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman/

Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman

Sole Panelist

Date: February 6, 2026.