

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Plano Molding Company, LLC v. Hongzhi YanHongzhi
Case No. D2026-0488

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Plano Molding Company, LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by Neal & McDevitt, LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Hongzhi YanHongzhi, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2026. On February 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 5, 2026, 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 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Benjamin Fontaine as the sole panelist in this matter on March 11, 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 the US company Plano Molding Company, LLC, which has been promoting, producing, and selling fishing equipment under the FRABILL brand since 1938.

The Complainant is the owner of several FRABILL trademarks, among which:

- United States trademark for FRABILL, registered under No. 1362134 on September 24, 1985, duly renewed since then, and claiming a first use in commerce dating back to July 9, 1938, and

- United States trademark for  registered under No. 4574273 on July 29, 2014, duly renewed since then and claiming a first use in commerce dating back to April 30, 2008.

The Complainant also promotes its brand online through its official website available via the <frabill.com> domain name.

The disputed domain name, <frabillus.com>, was registered on July 10, 2024. It resolved to a website purporting to offer a variety of FRABILL-branded fishing equipment for sale. This website prominently displayed the Complainant's trademark FRABILL.

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 first that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its earlier trademark FRABILL as the mark is identically reproduced within it and remains recognizable.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as there has never been any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent that would give rise to any license, sponsorship, permission, or authorization for the Respondent to use or register the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the FRABILL trademark in a domain name, on any website, or for any other purpose. The Respondent will not be able to provide any evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the Complainant claims that the Respondent is utilizing the FRABILL trademark in the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion. The Complainant adds that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or the mark FRABILL.

Third, the Complainant claims that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant alleges that, as its FRABILL trademark is well known, it is implausible to consider that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's rights when it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent has specifically selected a domain name that includes the Complainant's entire FRABILL trademark to confuse consumers and drive traffic to its website instead of the Complainant's website available through the <frabill.com> 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 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.¹ [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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the suffix "us", which may refer to the geographical term "United States", 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 3.1](#), 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 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.

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.

¹ Although some of the documentation submitted by the Complainant to establish its rights in respect of the invoked trademarks identifies a third-party as their holder, the Panel's verification conducted in the US trademark database has confirmed that the Complainant is indeed the holder of these trademarks. Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. This may include visiting the website linked to the disputed domain name in order to obtain more information about the respondent or its use of the domain name, consulting historical resources such as the Internet Archive (["www.archive.org"](#)) in order to obtain an indication of how a domain name may have been used in the relevant past, reviewing dictionaries or encyclopedias (e.g., Wikipedia), or accessing trademark registration databases. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

Not only is the Respondent unauthorized to use the FRABILL trademark, but there is also no evidence that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website purportedly dedicated to the Complainant's products. This website prominently displays the FRABILL trademark and reproduces the stylized version of this trademark as it appears on the Complainant's website. Moreover, the website under the disputed domain name shares an overall look and feel with the Complainant's website, in particular through the use of the same color scheme.

Such use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered legitimate as it is likely to confuse Internet users into believing that said disputed domain name and the related website are operated by, approved of, or affiliated with the Complainant, whereas this is not the case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.

Lastly, even assuming that the Respondent would be a reseller of the FRABILL products this would not change the above findings. Indeed, the Respondent would not comply with the "Oki Data test" (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#)), notably because the website under the disputed domain name does not disclose the (lack of) registrant's relationship with 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.

In the present case, the FRABILL trademark is a coined word, making it highly unlikely that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name by coincidence. Furthermore, the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the FRABILL trademark, resolves to a merchant website purportedly offering FRABILL products for sale, and imitating the Complainant's website.

It follows from the above that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Accordingly, 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 <frabillus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Benjamin Fontaine/

Benjamin Fontaine

Sole Panelist

Date: March 20, 2026