

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dansko, LLC v. 旦唐春 (Dan Tangchun)

Case No. D2026-0957

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dansko, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Cozen O’Connor, United States.

The Respondent is 旦唐春 (Dan Tangchun), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dansko-lifestyle-shop.com> is registered with Vantage of Convergence (Chengdu) Technology Co., Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 5, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 9, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 9, 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 in English on March 11, 2026.

On March 9, 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 11, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. 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 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man 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 is a provider of comfort footwear and has been operating since 1990. It offers footwear products including clogs, boots, sandals, flats, and sneakers, designed for long-wear and comfort. The Complainant's footwear has been widely used by customers around the world and is described as being a preferred choice among medical professionals for over two decades. The Complainant states that it has acquired and developed rights in the DANSKO mark through intensive use, advertising, and promotion in connection with its footwear goods.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of trademark registrations for DANSKO, which include, inter alia: United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Registration No. 2712957, DANSKO, registered on May 6, 2003; USPTO, Registration No. 3265196, DANSKO and Design, registered on July 17, 2007; USPTO, Registration No. 5638606, DANSKO NATURAL ARCH, registered on December 25, 2018; USPTO, Registration No. 6540779, DANSKO NATURAL ARCH PLUS, registered on October 26, 2021; and USPTO, Registration No. 4172633, DANSKO XP, registered on July 10, 2012. The Complainant also operates its official website at its domain name <dansko.com>.

The disputed domain name <dansko-lifestyle-shop.com> was registered on November 27, 2025. According to the Complainant's evidence, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that prominently featured the Complainant's DANSKO mark and logo and purported to offer the Complainant's footwear products. The website contains infringing content and is designed to give the impression that it is affiliated with, or operated by, the Complainant. The Panel notes that on the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name directs to an inactive or error website.

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 is confusingly similar to its DANSKO trademark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety together with the descriptive term "lifestyle shop", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and rather increases the likelihood of confusion given its connection to the Complainant's business. The Complainant further submits that it has established rights in the DANSKO mark through longstanding use and multiple trademark registrations in the United States.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized by, or commonly known by the Complainant's mark, and has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's trademarks and purporting to offer the Complainant's footwear products, thereby misleading consumers as to source or affiliation.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights, given the incorporation of the DANSKO mark and the content of the associated website. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. The Complainant also points to the Respondent's use of a privacy service and the alleged infringing nature of the website as further indicia of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is English. 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 proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English for several reasons, including that, the Registrar is ICANN-accredited, that the website at the disputed domain name is in English and appears intended to target English-speaking Internet users by creating an impression of affiliation with the Complainant, and that the Complainant is based in the United States.

The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's request for the language of the proceeding and did not submit any Response.

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 proceeding 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 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 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, “-lifestyle-shop”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

The Panel further notes that the record contains no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that it is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, or has made any demonstrable preparations for such use. To the contrary, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant’s DANSKO logo and trademarks and purporting to offer the Complainant’s products, thereby impersonating the Complainant and offering unauthorized products to Internet users. In this regard, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Additionally, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name, being confusingly similar to the Complainant’s longstanding and intensively used trademarks and consisting only of the Complainant’s trademark combined with the descriptive words “-lifestyle-shop”, carries a risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute fair use, as it effectively impersonates the Complainant and suggests endorsement by the Complainant (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1).

Finally, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive or error website. In this regard, the Panel finds that holding a domain name passively, without making any use of it, also does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollore SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#); and *Vente-Privee.Com and Vente-Privee.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1685](#)).

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 Respondent has registered the disputed domain name which incorporates the Complainant's prior DANSKO trademarks in their entirety. The Panel further notes that the Complainant's trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name (on November 27, 2025) by several decades, with the earliest of the abovementioned trademark registrations dating back to May 6, 2003. In these circumstances, the Panel considers that even a cursory Internet or trademark search at the time of registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent would have revealed the Complainant's longstanding rights in the DANSKO mark and its use in connection with footwear products. Moreover, the Panel observes that the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's DANSKO trademark and logo and impersonating the Complainant and purporting to offer the Complainant's products, which strongly supports a finding that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its mark at the time of registration. In the Panel's view, these circumstances indicate that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in a manner clearly falling within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, namely 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 as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of the products offered on it. Additionally, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Finally, on the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name directs to an inactive website. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <dansko-lifestyle-shop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: April 27, 2026