ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Green Connection, Inc. v. Kwangpyo Kim, Mediablue inc
Case No. D2026-0022

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Green Connection, Inc., United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), internally represented.

The Respondent is Kwangpyo Kim, Mediablue inc, Republic of Korea, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <greenconnection.com> is registered with GoDaddy Online Services Cayman Islands Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 3, 2026. On January 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 6, 2026, 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 (Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 13, 2026, 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 January 15, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 4, 2026. On January 26, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center requesting a ten-day extension for response. On January 26, 2026, the Complainant was invited to comment on the Respondent's extension request. On January 29, 2026, the Respondent was granted a ten-day extension for response, the new Response due was February 14, 2026.

The Response was filed with the Center on February 12, 2026.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on February 25, 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 corporation from Alaska, United States.

According to the website at "www.greenconnection.net", the Complainant is a landscape company that provides services in respect of interior plant care and exterior grounds maintenance.

The Complainant owns U.S. Trademark Registration No. 5,432,441 for GREEN CONNECTION that was filed on August 22, 2017, and registered on March 27, 2018, in class 44 for plant care services.

The Respondent is Kwangpyo Kim of Mediablue inc.

According to the Whois records, the disputed domain name was registered on October 12, 1998.

The Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in 2014 through a Namejet auction.

On January 15, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a webpage that included the text "Diese Domain kaufen" which translates into English as "buy this domain."

At the present time, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage with the textual link "Buy this domain" and pay-per-click ("PPC") links, including for CRT monitor degaussing guides, annual office dust reports, and bolted plastic pumps. The link for "Buy this domain" resolves to a page at the domain name <mydomaincontact.com> that requests contact information and states: "You are about to send an inquiry regarding the following domain: …" This page also has a link to "terms and conditions" from ParkingCrew of Germany. According to the Complainant's evidence, when filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a similar website with the textual link "Buy this domain" and PPC links.

The Respondent has been party to prior cases under the Policy, many of which where the Respondent was successful including *Everphone GmbH v. Privacydotlink Customer 2772294 / Kwangpyo Kim, Mediablue Inc*, WIPO Case No. D2017-0698, *ClearBank Limited v. Privacydotlink Customer 2450865 / Kwangpyo Kim, Mediablue Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2018-2481, and *Delta Dental Plans Association v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Kwangpyo Kim*, WIPO Case No. D2022-0566.

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 incorporates the Complainant's GREEN CONNECTION trademark in its entirety.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has never been licensed or authorized to use the GREEN CONNECTION trademark. Nothing indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by "Green Connection."

By using a domain name that is identical to the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement (Policy Paragraph 4(b)(iv)). The parked page and purchase solicitation reinforce the commercial nature of the use.

The Respondent also used a privacy/proxy service, which supports a finding of bad faith.

Prior panels have repeatedly found bad faith where the Respondent registered domain names corresponding to third-party marks and used them with PPC parking or resale.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the second and the third elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent purchased the disputed domain name because the disputed domain name was an available inherently valuable and two-word domain name. The Complainant's trademark was registered in 2018, and the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in 2014 through a Namejet.com auction, it cannot be argued that the Respondent acted in bad faith or targeted Complainant in any manner. The Respondent had no knowledge of the Complainant or its mark when it purchased the disputed domain name. In any event, it can hardly be argued that "green connection" is a common, well-known trademark.

The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with the goods or services marketed by the Complainant. Nor is there any evidence supporting any basis for bad faith.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the same reason it has many registered other short names or descriptive English word domains because of its inherent value as an online designator. There is no basis from which to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to target the Complainant's alleged trademark.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or 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.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

In view of the Panel's finding in respect of the third element of the Policy, the Panel does not need to reach a conclusion in respect of the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by (usually) the complainant.

There is no evidence that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant in mind or to target the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to take advantage of the Complainant or the Complainant's GREEN CONNECTION trademark.

The Complainant has provided no evidence of its reputation. The Complainant is located in Alaska, United States, and the Respondent is located in the Republic of Korea. There is no evidence that a person in the Republic of Korea would likely have been aware of the Complainant. There is also no evidence of the Complainant's reputation in 2014. That is, there is no evidence that the Respondent would have been aware of the Complainant when the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name in 2014. In short, the Complainant did not provide evidence to show that its GREEN CONNECTION trademark is so well known in 2014 that a person in the position of the Respondent must have heard of it. *So Bold Limited v. TechOps, VirtualPoint Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2022-1100.

Further, without determining whether the Respondent had a duty to search the United States trademark register, even if the Respondent did so or had a duty to do so, the Respondent could not have had knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights in 2014, because the Complainant filed its United States trademark application in 2017 which was three years after the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name.

The Respondent states, in a signed declaration, that it had no knowledge of Complainant, its web site, its business name or trademark when the Respondent participated in the NameJet auction to acquire the disputed domain name. This is believable.

The Respondent also states that it owns hundreds of common word domain names for investment purposes, and that it registered the disputed domain name because it was "an aged domain and as a two word valuable name". The Respondent states that it owns about 20 domain names that are two-word starting with "green", such as <greenpets.com> and <greenbus.com>. This suggests that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name because of the Complainant or its GREEN CONNECTION trademark.

There is no evidence before the Panel that the PPC links on the website at the disputed domain name related to the Complainant or to landscaping or gardening.

On the evidence before the Panel, the Respondent did not approach the Complainant in respect of the disputed domain name to offer the disputed domain name to the Complainant. Without further evidence, creating a website at the disputed domain name to advertise the disputed domain name for sale is not, of itself, bad faith use of the disputed domain name. *GUTEX Holzfaserplattenwerk H. Henselmann GmbH + Co. KG v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot, Tech Ops SyncPoint, Inc./ Mr. David Lahoti*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1056.

Dealing in domain names in the secondary market is a legitimate trading activity. By its very nature, it is speculative. A domain investor usually has the intention of reselling domain names at a price in excess of the purchase price. Some domain names sell, and some sit on the shelf unsold. Trying to make a profit by investing in and reselling domain names is not bad faith per se. *Sage Global Services Limited v. Narendra Ghimire, Deep Vision Architects*, WIPO Case No. DAI2023-0010.

In short, the evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark, because the Complainant had no trademark rights at the time that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.8.1.

The Complainant relies on two prior decisions under the Policy involving the Respondent to "illustrate a pattern consistent with the bad-faith indicia present here". However, the two cases cited by the Complainant were three-member panel decisions where the Respondent was successful and no bad faith was found.

The Panel finds that the Respondent did not register the disputed domain name in bad faith targeting of the Complainant or its trademark rights.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/John Swinson/
John Swinson
Sole Panelist
Date: March 11, 2026