

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

US Patriot, LLC v. Lily Daniel, Kunming Chenwen Trading Co., Ltd.
Case No. D2026-0546

1. The Parties

The Complainant is US Patriot, LLC, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Dinsmore & Shohl LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Lily Daniel, Kunming Chenwen Trading Co., Ltd., United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <usapatriott.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 9, 2026. On February 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 10, 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 (Privacy User #e8b9e845, PrivacyGuardian.org llc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 11, 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 February 11, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 11, 2026. On March 11 and 17, 2026, communications were received from an email address associated with the disputed domain name.

The Center appointed Mario Soerensen Garcia as the sole panelist in this matter on March 17, 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 supplier of military boots, uniforms, and high-performance tactical gear and accessories. It operates online and at more than 100 stores on and near military bases within the U.S. and overseas.

The Complainant owns trademarks consisting of U.S. PATRIOT including but not limited to:

Jurisdiction	Registration No.	Trademark	Registration Date	Classes
USPTO – United States Patent and Trademark Office	5,472,989	U.S. PATRIOT	May 22, 2018	35
USPTO – United States Patent and Trademark Office	5,472,999		May 22, 2018	35

The Complainant also owns the domain name <uspatriottactical.com>, registered on August 19, 2009.

The Respondent is Lily Daniel, Kunming Chenwen Trading Co., Ltd., from the United Kingdom.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 23, 2025, and resolves to an inactive page. However, at the time of the Complaint submission, the disputed domain name resolved to a web page offering clothing articles and other goods for sale. (The Complainant documented the website under the disputed domain name in Annexes 2(a) to 2(g) of the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark U.S. PATRIOT.

The Complainant alleged that there is no evidence that the Respondent has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for legitimate bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with any noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

That being the case, the Complainant finds that the disputed domain name is likely to make Internet users assume that the disputed domain name offers goods/services supplied by the Complainant.

According to the Complainant, it has prior rights over the trademark U.S. PATRIOT and has not authorized the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's intellectual property rights for the U.S. PATRIOT trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that the registration and the use of the disputed domain name have been conducted in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On March 11 and 17, 2026, the Center received identical email communications from an email address connected to the disputed domain name:

"[...] Thank you for bringing this potential infringement issue to our attention. We take intellectual property rights seriously and will immediately initiate a thorough internal investigation. We will respond with our findings and corrective actions within 5 business days. Your patience is appreciated [...]"

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

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

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 Selected 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 mark U.S. PATRIOT is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior marks 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

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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name or that before any notice of the dispute the Respondent has made use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant brings the Panel's attention to the fact that a reviews for the website under the disputed domain name indicate that customers who place orders are not receiving any merchandise, or that if they do receive merchandise, it is significantly different from that advertised on the site.

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 Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademarks as the disputed domain name reproduces the U.S. PATRIOT trademark and is confusingly similar to the Complainant's domain name. Besides, the Complainant's trademark registrations and domain name predate the registration date of the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The website under the disputed domain name had contradicting and potentially incorrect information. Although the website indicated that it was run by a US company the return address was based in China. Taking together with the customer reviews provided by the Complainant about the website, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the website is a pretense for trading off of the Complainant's reputation. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed as passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel's position is further reinforced by the fact that the Respondent has not formally replied to the Complainant's contentions but has taken down the website associated with the disputed domain name.

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 <usapatriott.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mario Soerensen Garcia/

Mario Soerensen Garcia

Sole Panelist

Date: March 31, 2026