

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

HNI Technologies, Inc. v. Liudmyla Veselovska  
Case No. D2025-5295

### 1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Liudmyla Veselovska, Ukraine.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <harman-stoves.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 18, 2025. On December 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On December 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (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 19, 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 23, 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 January 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on February 2, 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 a United States company that since 1979 has (either directly or through a predecessor in interest) offered a variety of stoves and related products under the HARMAN brand. It has promoted and sold its Harman products through various channels, including online where it owns the domain name <harmanstoves.com> which redirects to a relevant sub-page of the Complainant's existing website offering Harman products.

The Complainant has held a trademark registration for the word mark HARMAN ("HARMAN Mark") in various jurisdictions including the United Kingdom, the United States, and the European Union. The Complainant's registration of the HARMAN Mark in the United States dates from 2012 (Registration No. 4,213,297, registered September 25, 2012, for goods including fuel burning stoves in class 11).

The Domain Name was registered on August 30, 2025. The Domain Name resolves to a website (the "Respondent's Website") that provides information about the Complainant and purports to sell the Complainant's pellet stove products. The Respondent's Website reproduces the Complainant's logo and the Complainant's marketing images and contains no disclaimer to the effect that the Respondent is unconnected to the Complainant.

#### **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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) It is the owner of the HARMAN Mark, having registered the HARMAN Mark in the United States and various other jurisdictions. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the HARMAN Mark as it merely adds the term "-stoves" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" to the mark.
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not granted any license or authorization for the Respondent to use the HARMAN Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the HARMAN Mark, nor does it use the Domain Name for a bona fide purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Rather the Respondent is using the Domain Name to pass off as the Complainant for commercial gain by reproducing the Complainant's mark and information about the Complainant either for the purpose of confusing consumers as to the identity of the Respondent's Website or to engage in phishing or other nefarious conduct. Such use is not a legitimate use of the Domain Name.
- c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the Domain Name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Respondent's Website to disrupt the Complainant's business and for commercial gain. Such conduct amounts to registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Preliminary Procedural Considerations**

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Since the Respondent's location is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may affect case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

While it is unclear if the Written Notice was delivered by post to the Respondent, it appears that the Notification of Complaint emails were delivered at the Respondent's email address, as provided by the Registrar. Therefore, there is no evidence that the case notification was not successfully delivered to the disclosed Respondent's email address.

It is moreover noted that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Panel has no serious doubt (albeit in the absence of any Response) that the Respondent registered and has used the Domain Name in bad faith and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's goodwill in its trademark.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and decides that the administrative proceedings should continue (see *Netbet Entreprises Ltd v. Privacy Service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Vladimir Vladimir, Crowd inc*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1420](#)).

### **6.2. Substantive Matters**

#### **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 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 Domain Name. Accordingly, the 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 "-stoves" 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 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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.
- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.
- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to mislead consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4.
- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The Respondent has used the Domain Name to operate a website to sell stoves that purport to be legitimate Harman products. It is unclear whether Respondent actually sells these products and if the products sold are counterfeit or genuine products produced by the Complainant. If the stoves sold on the Respondent’s Website are not genuine products produced by the Complainant, the Respondent’s use of the Domain Name does not grant it rights or legitimate interests since it is using the Complainant’s HARMAN Mark for a site selling counterfeit products.

Even if the Respondent is offering genuine Harman products from the Respondent’s Website, such use does not automatically grant it rights or legitimate interests. The principles that govern whether a reseller of genuine goods has rights or legitimate interests have been set out in a variety of UDRP decisions, starting with the case of *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) (“Oki Data test”).

The [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8 summarizes the consensus views of UDRP panels in assessing claims of nominative (fair) use by resellers or distributors in the following manner:

“... Panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant’s trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant’s goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the ‘Oki Data test’, the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the trademark.

The “Oki Data test” does not apply where any prior agreement, express or otherwise, between the parties expressly prohibits (or allows) the registration or use of domain names incorporating the complainant’s trademark.”

In this case, the Respondent’s Website does not accurately or prominently disclose the Respondent’s relationship with the Complainant, in particular that it is not an authorized dealer or has any particular connection with the Complainant. Rather the absence of a disclaimer and the presence of the Complainant’s logo and marketing images of the Complainant’s products results in the impression that the Respondent’s Website is an official website of the Complainant or an authorized reseller. Under the circumstances of this case, even in the event that the Respondent is reselling genuine Harman products, its use of the Domain Name for the Respondent’s Website does not grant it rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Moreover, the nature of the Domain Name itself, which incorporates the Complainant’s mark and a term descriptive of its products, effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

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 Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its reputation in the HARMAN Mark at the time the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Respondent has provided no explanation, and neither is it immediately obvious, why an entity would register a domain name that wholly incorporates the HARMAN Mark and direct it to a website purportedly offering stoves under the Complainant’s HARMAN Mark (non-complying with the requirements of the Oki Data test) unless there was an awareness of and an intention to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its HARMAN Mark. Furthermore, as discussed earlier in the Decision, the Respondent’s Website contains material that implies that the Respondent’s Website is operated by or connected to the Complainant. The registration of the Domain Name in awareness of the HARMAN Mark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has passed off as the Complainant and purported to offer stoves, be they genuine or otherwise, under the Complainant’s HARMAN Mark on the Respondent’s Website without the Complainant’s approval and without meeting the Oki Data test. The Panel finds that the Respondent is using the Domain Name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the HARMAN Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s Website. Paragraph 4(b)(iv)

of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 Domain Name <harman-stoves.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Nicholas Smith/*

**Nicholas Smith**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 4, 2026