ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Jelmar, LLC v. lin zhi peng
Case No. D2026-0687

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jelmar, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP, United States.

The Respondent is lin zhi peng, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <clrbrandsus.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 17, 2026. On February 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 19, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 19, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On February 19, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On February 25, 2026, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint requesting that English be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 25, 2026. In accordance with

the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Rachel Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 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 limited company incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois, United States. The Complainant distributes and sells a range of household and industrial cleaning products, including the CLR family of products. The Complainant's business and products have a widespread presence online, in retail shelves, and through industrial sales channels across the United States and in numerous other jurisdictions around the world.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for CLR and CLR BRANDS, including:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1094137 CLR, registered on September 22, 2011, in classes 1 and 3;

- United States Trademark Registration No. 7517942 CLR BRANDS, registered on September 24, 2024, in classes 1 and 3; and

United States Trademark Registration No. 7517943 , registered on September 24, 2024, in classes 1 and 3.

The Complainant owns the domain name <clrbrands.com>, which incorporates its CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks. This domain name was registered on February 7, 2007, and has been used as the official website for the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS products and business.

The Respondent is reportedly based in China. The disputed domain name was registered on January 26, 2026. Presently, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website. According to the Complainant's evidence, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website mimicking the Complainant's official site, displaying the Complainant's trademark and allegedly selling and offering the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS products.

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 consists entirely of the Complainant's CLR BRANDS trademark, the geographically descriptive term "us", and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The addition of a generic or geographic term to a registered trademark in a disputed domain name does not avoid the likelihood of confusion. The Complainant's CLR BRANDS trademark is recognizable in, and is the dominant feature of, the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the Complainant's

trademarks in any form. Given the reputation of the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks, the Respondent's unauthorized and fraudulent use of the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain name to pass off the website associated with the disputed domain name as being operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant clearly establishes that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name solely to intentionally trade on the reputation of the Complainant and the CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent does not meet criteria established in the Oki Data case (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903) for legitimate use by a reseller.

The Complainant finally contends that the website associated with the disputed domain name copied content from the Complainant's official website. Accordingly, the Respondent had full knowledge of the Complainant and its CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks when registering the disputed domain name or at least had constructive knowledge, given the Complainant's established worldwide trademark rights in CLR and CLR BRANDS. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host a fraudulent website on which it holds itself out as the Complainant is evidence of the Respondent's bad faith. Furthermore, the Respondent's use of fake contact information and a proxy service to register the disputed domain name are further indicative of bad faith. In addition, although the website associated with the disputed domain name has been disabled as a result of the Complainant's prior complaint to the Registrar, the Respondent continues to hold the disputed domain name. There remains a risk that the Respondent may further use the disputed domain name to engage in fraudulent activity and cause confusion among unsuspecting consumers.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issue - Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, including the fact that 1) using Chinese as language of the proceedings would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter; 2) the disputed domain name consists of English words, displayed in Latin characters; and 3) the website associated with the disputed domain name contained English content, which indicate that the Respondent is able to understand English.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the available records, the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The gTLD ".com" as a standard registration requirement should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy.

The entirety of the CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks are reproduced within the disputed domain name. While the disputed domain name includes the terms "brands" and "us" in comparison with the CLR trademark, and the term "us" in comparison with the CLR BRANDS trademark, the CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the extra terms do not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 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.

The information in the case file shows that:

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks for any reason or in any manner;

- there is no evidence proving that the Respondent holds any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name, or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name;

- the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website but previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's CLR trademark and allegedly selling and offering the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS products without any prominent and accurate explanation of the relationship (or lack thereof) between the Parties. Rather, the website previously exhibited at the disputed domain name mimicked the Complainant's official site. Such use of the disputed domain name indicates the Respondent's intention to divert Internet traffic to the website associated with the disputed domain name by misleading Internet users into believing that the website associated with the disputed domain name is operated or

endorsed by the Complainant, which cannot be deemed as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;

- the nature of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's CLR BRANDS trademark, together with the term "us" which may refer to the abbreviation for the United States – the Complainant's place of incorporation, coupled with the prior use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website in which the Respondent tried to impersonate the Complainant, affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name; and

- no other factors demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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.

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 notes that the Complainant obtained the trademark registrations for its CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks predating the registration date of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant's evidence, the Panel accepts that the Complainant and its CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks have gained a certain degree of reputation and recognition in numerous jurisdictions through its extensive use and advertising. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name that fully incorporates the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks and resolved the disputed domain name to a website displaying the Complainant's CLR trademark, mimicking the Complainant's official site and allegedly selling and offering the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS products. The Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and the CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name, and bad faith is found.

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 disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website at the time of the Decision but was once used to host a website displaying the Complainant's CLR trademark, mimicking the Complainant's official site and allegedly selling and offering the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS products. The Panel holds that by selecting a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks, and using it in the manner as described, the Respondent obviously intended to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CLR and CLR BRANDS trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website associated with the disputed domain name, which constitutes bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Given the Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain name, the current non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith.

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 <clrbrandsus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rachel Tan/
Rachel Tan
Sole Panelist
Date: April 7, 2026