

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Leatherman Tool Group, Inc. v. Miller Sarah
Case No. D2026-0127

1. The Parties

Complainant is Leatherman Tool Group, Inc., United States of America “(United States)”, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

Respondent is Miller Sarah, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Names <leathermanofficial.com> and <leathermanstore.net> (the “Disputed Domain Names”) are registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 13, 2026. On January 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On February 3, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 25, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on March 6, 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

Complainant was founded in 1983 in the United States by Timothy Leatherman and Steve Berliner. Complainant provides multi-purpose tools. The initial LEATHERMAN tool was called the Pocket Survival Tool ("PST"). Eight years in the making, the PST was comprised of 13 different tools and folded up into a five-ounce, four-inch toolbox. In the first year of business, Tim Leatherman and Steve Berliner hoped to sell 4,000 tools; instead, they sold 30,000. Over the next decade, they sold over one million PST multi-tools. Today, LEATHERMAN tools are sold and used across Complainant's home country of the United States and beyond. Complainant's official website is "www.leatherman.com" which is used to facilitate transactions between Complainant and its customers. Complainant's products are also featured on popular marketplaces, such as Amazon, and have established brands as authorized reseller, such as Cotswold Outdoor and Multi-Tool Store.

Complaint's products consist of multi-tools, similar to that of the PST, wearables, knives, pocket tools, and other related accessories, with their most successful tools being the "wave", "skeletool", "juice", and "tread", many of which have received positive recognition in the general public.

Complainant, its affiliates, subsidiaries, and associated companies, own trademark registrations in numerous jurisdictions, including without limitation the following (collectively, the "LEATHERMAN Mark"):

United States Registration No. 1,325,473 for LEATHERMAN registered March 19, 1985 in class 8;

United States Registration No. 2,596,689 for LEATHERMAN registered July 23, 2002 in class 25; and

European Union Registration No. 000041731 for LEATHERMAN registered March 31, 2004 in classes 18, 25 and 28.

Complainant further uses the LEATHERMAN Mark as part of its brand logo.

Complaint registered its official domain name <leatherman.com> on October 19, 1995. Complainant's official website receives an average of 1.1 million visits per month from users around the world including, for example, from the United States, Canada, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered on July 15, 2025. Previously both Disputed Domain Names resolved to online stores displaying Complainant's logo and selling Complainant's products. Currently only the Disputed Domain Name <leathermanofficial.com> resolves to a website which displays pay-per-click ("PPC") links. This Disputed Domain Name is also enrolled in a mail exchange ("MX") allowing for the sending and receiving of email.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the extensive exposure of the LEATHERMAN Mark and its branded products has led to Complainant obtaining both national and international recognition in the tool market. Complainant's online presence is vital to maintaining its reputation as a leading multi-tool retailer.

Complainant further contends that, in addition to trademarks, Complainant has also registered several domain names featuring the LEATHERMAN Mark, with the sole purpose of allowing its customers to access and use its services from all around the world. In addition to Complainant's official website, its other domain names include, without limitation: <leatherman.ca>, <leatherman.be>, <leatherman.cn>, <leatherman.co.uk>, and <leatherman.mx>, many of which redirect to the official website. Domain names are considered an important part of Complainant's overall operations, and any attempt to take advantage of its brand is likely to cause detriment to its business.

Complainant further contends that, in 2018, it launched the LEATHERMAN World Tour to celebrate its 35th anniversary. This was made as a homage to how the LEATHERMAN Mark was born, when Complainant's founders created the first LEATHERMAN multi-tool, following a car trip to all of Europe, traveling from Amsterdam to Iran (Islamic Republic of) via Scandinavia and Eastern Europe. More than 40 years later, Complainant now sells its products in more than 70 countries across the globe. Complainant also has active social media accounts on X, Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram and YouTube.

Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar because they contain the entirety of the LEATHERMAN Mark. The only additional terms are the addition of the words "official" and "store" which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Complainant submits that Respondent has received no license from Complainant to use LEATHERMAN Mark in the Disputed Domain Names

Complainant further submits that the Disputed Domain Names have previously resolved to identical online shops which impersonated Complainant by using the LEATHERMAN Mark and Complainant's logo and by allegedly selling Complainant's products. Complainant further submits that the use of the Disputed Domain Names in order to pass off as Complainant and to capitalize on the LEATHERMAN Mark is not a bona fide offering of good or services. Respondent uses visual indicia from Complainant's main website, purporting to sell goods under Complainant's name.

Complainant further submits that the Disputed Domain Name <leathermanofficial.com> is being used to re-direct Internet users to PPC advertisement links that redirects users to third-party offerings. Such use is not bona fide because it utilizes the LEATHERMAN Mark to capitalize on its reputation and goodwill.

Complainant further submits the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names. Respondent is not offering any genuine goods or services. Therefore, there is no plausible reason for the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names, other than to take advantage of the goodwill and reputation of the LEATHERMAN Mark.

Complainant alleges that Respondent has engaged in opportunistic bad faith, as provided for in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy

Complainant further alleges that Respondent is trying to gather sensitive information from Internet users under the guise of an implied affiliation with, or authorization by, Complainant – constituting phishing.

Complainant further alleges that Respondent's activation of MX records for the Disputed Domain Name <leathermanofficial.com> allows for the sending and receipt of email. Such MX records support Complainant's allegation that Respondent could engage in phishing.

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Names.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainant's assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainant to verify that the three essential elements of the claims are met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- i) that the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the LEATHERMAN Mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and
- iii) that the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1 states that registration of the LEATHERMAN Mark is prima facie evidence of Complainant having enforceable rights in the LEATHERMAN Mark.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the LEATHERMAN Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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 LEATHERMAN Mark and the Disputed Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the LEATHERMAN Mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the LEATHERMAN Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, "official" and "store", 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 Disputed Domain Names and the LEATHERMAN Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy allows three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Names or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the LEATHERMAN Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that neither offering for sale Complainant’s products without indicating the websites’ lack of relationship with Complainant nor use of the Disputed Domain Name <leathermanofficial.com> to host a parked page comprising PPC links, some of which advertise products competing with Complainant’s, is not a bona fide offering.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainant to show bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names:

- (i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Names primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Names registration to Complainant who is the owner of the LEATHERMAN Mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Names; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Names in order to prevent the owner of the LEATHERMAN Mark from reflecting the LEATHERMAN Mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Names primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the Disputed Domain Names, you [Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the LEATHERMAN Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

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 the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent has engaged in activity that meets the criteria of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and is, therefore, in bad faith.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 Names <leathermanofficial.com> and <leathermanstore.net> be transferred to Complainant.

/Richard W. Page/

Richard W. Page

Sole Panelist

Date: March 20, 2026