

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Yokogawa Electric Corporation v. Leo Lee, iiiC
Case No. D2026-0252

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Yokogawa Electric Corporation, Japan, represented by Fish & Richardson P.C., United States of America.

The Respondent is Leo Lee, iiiC, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <yokogawaindustries.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 21, 2026. On January 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 23, 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 (Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 23, 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 23, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 February 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 24, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on February 14, 2026. The Center sent a possible settlement email to the parties on February 16, 2026. The Complainant sent an email to the Center on March 2, 2026, and did not request suspension of proceedings. On March 9, 2026, the Center notified the parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process.

The Center appointed Andrew F. Christie as the sole panelist in this matter on March 12, 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 provides industrial automation and process control, test and measurement, information systems and industrial services, offering a wide range of goods and services including distributed control systems, safety instrumented systems, field instruments such as pressure transmitters and flow meters, analyzers, and advanced test-and-measurement equipment (e.g., oscilloscopes and power analyzers). It also provides consulting, digital-transformation, and cybersecurity services; project- execution and modernization services for complex industrial facilities; lifecycle maintenance and training programs; and specialized life-science and laboratory solutions such as high-content imaging systems, bioprocessing platforms, and single-cell analysis tools. The Complainant is a publicly traded company with a reported total annual revenue of JPY 562.4 billion (equivalent to roughly USD 3.62 billion) for the 2025 fiscal year. It employs more than 17,000 people and operates in 62 countries around the world together with its multiple subsidiaries and affiliates.

The Complainant holds numerous registrations in a range of countries for the word trademark YOKOGAWA, including United States Trademark No. 2816888 (registered on February 24, 2004) and European Union Trademark No. 003212561 (registered on April 6, 2005). The Complainant also holds registrations in a range of countries for the word trademark OPREX, including United States Trademark No. 5993003 (registered on February 25, 2020), and for the logo trademark of a stylized diamond, including United States Trademark No. 1475690 (registered on February 9, 1998).

The Complainant holds a number of registrations of domain names containing its YOKOGAWA word trademark, including <yokogawa.com> and <yokogawa.co.jp>.

The disputed domain name was created on July 3, 2024. The Complainant has provided screenshots, taken on October 30, 2025, of the website to which the disputed domain name then resolved. The website was headed “Co-innovating Tomorrow”, with the subheading “We offer OpreX Control / OpreX Measurement / Test & Measurement”. The website apparently provides downloadable pdfs of manuals owned by the Complainant and related to its products, which include the YOKOGAWA word trademark and diamond logo trademark, and a copyright notice indicating that Complainant is the owner of such works.

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active location.

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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights, on the following grounds, among others. The mere addition of descriptive or generic terms, such as “industries”, to the disputed domain name fails to alleviate confusion or distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s YOKOGAWA trademark. The mere addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is not only irrelevant in determining whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s YOKOGAWA trademark but also intentionally and purposefully misleads visitors as to the identity of the website owner.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, on the following grounds, among others. A complainant needs only show prima facie evidence of a lack of rights or legitimate interests in order to shift the burden of proof to the respondent. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, which evidences its lack of rights or legitimate interests. At the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, and at all relevant times, it had no trademark or intellectual property rights in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not associated or affiliated with the Complainant and the Complainant has not granted any rights to the Respondent to use the Complainant's YOKOGAWA trademark, OPREX trademark, or diamond logo trademark, or the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes neither a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to Policy paragraph 4(c)(i) nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use pursuant to Policy paragraph 4(c)(iii). The website resolving from the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's YOKOGAWA trademark, OPREX trademark, diamond logo trademark, as well as the Complainant's bylines "Co-innovating tomorrow" and "Test&Measurement," and promotes the Complainant's products. This use and impersonation divert visitors – likely the Complainant's customers and potential customers – to the Respondent's website and away from the Complainant's legitimate website, to induce a mistaken belief that the Respondent is connected to the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, on the following grounds, among others. At the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the YOKOGAWA trademark was sufficiently distinctive or famous to give constructive notice to the Respondent that the registration of the disputed domain name would violate the Complainant's rights. The Respondent is evidently impersonating the Complainant by using the Complainant's YOKOGAWA trademark, OPREX trademark and diamond logo trademark, as well as the Complainant's bylines "Co-innovating tomorrow" and "Test&Measurement," and promotes the Complainant's products. The Respondent's creation of a website that impersonates the Complainant alone constitutes bad faith, as it disrupts the Complainant's business and seeks to capitalize on confusion with the YOKOGAWA trademark. The use of the disputed domain name for per se illegitimate activity, such as copyright infringement, trademark infringement, impersonation and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent, and such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

The Respondent did, however, send an email to the Center saying: "I hereby provide my unconditional consent to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant (Yokogawa Electric Corporation)." The parties did not reach a settlement.

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 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. It is the owner of a trademark registration for the word trademark YOKOGAWA.

The entirety of the Complainant's word trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the addition only of the word "industries" and the gTLD ".com". The Complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, and that the addition of the word "industries" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 that 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its YOKOGAWA trademark. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolved to a website that contained the Complainant’s YOKOGAWA, OPREX and diamond logo trademarks, and provided downloadable pdfs of manuals owned by the Complainant, related to its products, and containing the Complainant’s trademarks. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name in this way unfairly took advantage of the Complainant’s trademarks for the Respondent’s benefit. Such use of the disputed domain name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, and is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Accordingly, such use does not confer on the Respondent rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has not rebutted this. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In the present case, the Panel notes that: (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name some decades after the Complainant first registered its YOKOGAWA trademark; (ii) the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, and merely adds the word “industries”, which refers to a type of business sector in which the Complainant uses its YOKOGAWA trademark; and (iii) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a web location at which the Complainant’s trademark is used. It is clear the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark.

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 evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <yokogawaindustries.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew F. Christie/

Andrew F. Christie

Sole Panelist

Date: March 26, 2026