

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

1461630 Ontario Inc. v. 唐志英 (zhiyingtang)

Case No. D2026-0911

1. The Parties

The Complainant is 1461630 Ontario Inc., Canada, represented by K&S Partners, India.

The Respondent is 唐志英 (zhiyingtang), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rapidholdingsystem.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 3, 2026. On March 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 4, 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 (Rapid Holding System Co Ltd) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 5, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On March 5, 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 March 10, 2026, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint containing a request 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 March 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Rachel Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on April 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, established in 2001 in Canada, is a privately held precision engineering company specializing in advanced workholding solutions for EDM, Wire EDM (WEDM), and CNC machining applications. The Complainant states that it supplies customers globally, shipping products worldwide, and has developed significant goodwill and a reputation for reliability, technical precision, and cost-effective tooling. The Complainant's customer base includes precision manufacturers, mold and plastic manufacturers, research institutions, and advanced engineering organizations operating in high-accuracy machining environments.

The Complainant owns below trademark registrations for RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS:

- Canada Trademark Registration No. TMA1017748 RHS, registered on March 20, 2019, in classes 7 and 40; and

- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 5546595 RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS, registered on August 21, 2018, in classes 7 and 40.

The Complainant owns the domain name <rapidholdingsystems.com>, which incorporates its RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark. This domain name was registered on December 17, 2014, and has been used as the official website for the Complainant's RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS products and business.

The Respondent is reportedly based in China. The disputed domain name was registered on February 19, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's RHS trademark, copies product images from the Complainant's official website, and allegedly offers products identical to the Complainant's products, bearing the Complainant's RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademarks.

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 wholly incorporates the Complainant's RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark, with the sole and negligible difference being the omission of the letter "s" at the end of the word "system". The omission of the letter "s" is a typo squatting that intends to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and the associated website are affiliated with the Complainant. Moreover, the Complainant's RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademarks have been slavishly copied on the website associated with the disputed domain name without any authorization. Therefore, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent and has never authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks in any form. The Respondent is neither commonly known by the disputed domain name nor owns any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is intentionally trading on the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant and its trademarks and fraudulently diverting

Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and the associated website are affiliated with the Complainant for commercial gain. In addition, the Complainant previously sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent while the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letter, which further confirms that the Respondent cannot demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant's prior domain name <rapidholdingsystems.com> and its RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademarks that had already established substantial goodwill and reputation.

The Complainant's RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark is an arbitrary and distinctive combination of words. It is inconceivable that the Respondent could have independently conceived the visually and phonetically identical disputed domain name. The website associated with the disputed domain name allegedly offers products identical to the Complainant's products and copies product images from the Complainant's official website without authorization. Those product images also display the Complainant's RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademarks. By registering and using the disputed domain name in this way, the Respondent is misleading Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and the associated website are affiliated with the Complainant for commercial gain. Moreover, the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letter further indicates bad faith use and registration of the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name prevents the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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) the disputed domain name consists entirely of English words; 2) the content on the website associated with the disputed domain name is in English, which indicates that the Respondent is able to understand English; 3) using Chinese as language of the proceedings would unfairly disadvantage and burden the Complainant and delay the proceedings and adjudication of this matter; 4) the Complainant has no knowledge of Chinese, and using Chinese as language of the proceedings would be prejudicial to the Complainant without corresponding benefit to the Respondent.

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.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" as a standard registration requirement should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with only the final letter "s" omitted. The Panel finds that the omission of this single letter does not preclude the Complainant's RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name, nor does it prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark 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 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 available record shows that:

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the Complainant's RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademarks in any form;
- 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 resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's RHS trademark, copies product images from the Complainant's official website, and allegedly offers products identical to the Complainant's products, bearing the Complainant's RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademarks, without any prominent and accurate explanation of the relationship (or lack thereof) between the Parties. Such use of the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent intends to divert Internet traffic to the website associated with the disputed domain name for commercial gain, by trading on the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant and its trademarks and creating confusion as to the relationship between the website associated with the disputed domain name and the Complainant. This use cannot be regarded as a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;

- the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's contentions in this administrative proceeding, and the Respondent has continued to use the disputed domain name in the manner described. In these circumstances, it is not plausible to infer that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed 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 RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark predating the registration date of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant's evidence, the Panel accepts that the Complainant and its RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademarks have gained a certain degree of reputation and recognition in relevant market through its extensive use and advertising. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name that fully incorporates the Complainant's RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark, with only the final letter "s" omitted and resolves to a website that displays the Complainant's RHS trademark, copies product images from the Complainant's official website, and allegedly offers products identical to the Complainant's products, bearing the Complainant's RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademarks. The Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and the RHS and RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS 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 Panel holds that by selecting a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark, and using it in the manner as described above, the Respondent obviously intends to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain name and the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's RAPID HOLDING SYSTEMS trademark 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.

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 <rapidholdingsystem.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rachel Tan/

Rachel Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: April 27, 2026