

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

The Carriage House Companies, Inc. v. KRIS ANDIKA  
Case No. D2026-1357

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is The Carriage House Companies, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Iverson IP, United States.

The Respondent is KRIS ANDIKA, Cambodia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <king-syrup.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 30, 2026. On March 31, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 1, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 7, 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 9, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 April 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Anne-Virginie La Spada as the sole panelist in this matter on May 12, 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 owns a United States trademark registration for the mark KING No. 3725423, registered on December 15, 2009, in relation to syrups in class 30. The mark was first used in commerce in 1890.

One of the product lines sold under the mark KING is called “King Syrup”.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 3, 2024.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying a logo with a lion’s head identical to the logo featured on “King Syrup” bottles. The website featured statements such as “At our family-owned molasses works, we slowly cook sugarcane juice [...]”. The website also featured images of, and product descriptions for, the “King Syrup” products as well as alleged consumers’ comments. Visitors were invited to enter their contact information to sign up for a newsletter, with the promise of receiving a discount and “special perks”. Finally, under contact information, an email address corresponding to the disputed domain name was provided.

The Panel observes that the disputed domain name currently redirects to a gambling website in Indonesian.

#### **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, which contains its mark KING, is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. According to the Complainant, the presence of the descriptive term “syrup” does nothing to differentiate the disputed domain name from its registered mark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not listed as an owner of any United States trademark containing a formative of the term “king”, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent owns or has applied for any United States trademark registrations. The Complainant points out that there is also no evidence that the Respondent, as an individual, business or other organization, is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant further observes that the Respondent has made no use of, nor any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or any name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Further, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the Respondent appears to be using the Complainant’s trademark to illegitimately gather email addresses from visitors to its website, luring visitors to enter their contact information to sign up for a newsletter, with the promise of receiving a discount for joining.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that its trademark is well known in connection with syrup and related products. The Respondent must therefore be familiar with the Complainant, its presence in the food and beverage industry, and its well-known trademark. The registration of a well-known trademark in a domain name, of which the Respondent must reasonably have been aware, constitutes opportunistic bad faith in the Complainant’s opinion.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is an intentional, nefarious attempt to attract for commercial gain Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website. The Complainant considers accordingly that the disputed domain was registered and used in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant must assert and prove each of the following:

- (i) the domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name registered by the respondent 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 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. [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 another term (here, "syrup") 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.

The Respondent does not appear to have operated any bona fide or legitimate business under the disputed domain name and is not making a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's logo and its "King Syrup" products, and impersonating the Complainant. Furthermore, even though product prices were mentioned, the website did not seem to offer any possibility of on-line purchase. The only interaction proposed with visitors was the invitation to sign up for a newsletter. This strongly suggests that the Respondent used or intended to use the disputed domain name for phishing purposes.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Further, although the disputed domain name consists of dictionary terms, it is clear to the Panel that the Respondent targeted the Complainant by trading off its trademark. In the Panel's view, such use would undermine any claim to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10.

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.

Given the longstanding use of the Complainant's trademark, and the circumstances of the use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name without having the Complainant's mark in mind. The combination of the Complainant's mark with the term "syrup", which directly refers to the Complainant's goods, cannot have been a coincidence, which is further reinforced by the use to which the disputed domain name has been put. The Panel therefore accepts that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the use of a disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of a web site or location or of a product or service on the website or location, amounts to evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

In the present case, the Respondent used the disputed domain name in connection with a website displaying the Complainant's logo, images of the Complainant's goods and purporting to be an official website. Such use was apt to create the false impression that the Respondent's website was operated or endorsed by the Complainant. Consequently, by using the disputed domain name in such manner, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source and affiliation of its website. Such behavior constitutes use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the current use of the disputed domain name in connection with an Indonesian gambling website rather reinforces the finding that there was no good faith intention behind the registration and earlier use of the disputed domain name.

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 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 <king-syrup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Anne-Virginie La Spada/*

**Anne-Virginie La Spada**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 26, 2026