

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Stove Kraft Limited v. Vladimir Veselovskiy
Case No. D2026-1455

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Stove Kraft Limited, India, represented by KRIA Law, India.

The Respondent is Vladimir Veselovskiy, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pigeoncookware.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 6, 2026. On April 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 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 amendments to the Complaint on April 13 and April 15, 2026, and an amended Complaint on April 15, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendments to the Complaint and 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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on May 18, 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 public limited company incorporated under the laws of India. Founded in 1994, the company employs more than 3000 employees.

The Complainant manufactures and trades in kitchen and home appliances both in India and internationally. Its product portfolio includes pressure cookers, cookware, cooktops, induction and infrared cooktops, chimneys and hobs, cooking appliances, mixer grinders, wet grinders, dough makers, fans, personal care items, and LED lighting products. The Complainant markets its products under its own brands Pigeon, Gilma, and Pigeon LED.

The Complainant holds several registered trademarks for PIGEON in India, namely Registration No. 1198490, registered from May 13, 2003, in class 21 (cookware & utensils), Registration No. 1198491, registered from May 13, 2003, in class 11 (appliances & heating) and Registration No. 2554706 registered from June 26, 2013, in class 9 (electrical & power Control). It also holds a trademark registration for PIGEON (design), under Registration No. 2554706 registered from June 26, 2013, in class 9 (electrical & power Control).

The disputed domain name was registered on March 23, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant. It has the following welcome message “We’re Pigeon Cookware and Kitchen Appliances. Pigeon Cookware blends affordability with reliability, making it a trusted brand for Indian kitchens. Offering a wide range of high-quality products like pressure cookers, non-stick cookware, and induction cooktops, Pigeon simplifies cooking for every household. With a focus on safety, durability, and innovation, it’s the go-to choice for practical and efficient kitchen solutions”. The website uses the Complainant’s trademark including its logo and imitates the color and look and feel of the Complainant’s trademark. There is no disclaimer on the website; however, there is a notice at the bottom of the webpage that reads “Pigeon Cookware (pigeoncookware.com) is a participant in the Amazon Services LLC Associates Program, an affiliate advertising program designed to provide a means for sites to earn advertising fees by advertising and linking to amazon.com”.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Matters – Further Procedural Considerations

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition. Since the Respondent’s mailing address is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel is of the view that they should. The Panel notes the Notification of the Complaint was sent to the email address disclosed for the Respondent by the Registrar in its Registrar Verification Response related to the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the case notification emails to the email address indicated in the Whois was not successfully delivered. Postal email was also sent to the address indicated in the Whois registration, but the delivery failed because the recipient was absent.

Finally, the Panel notes that, for the reasons which are set out later in this Decision, the Respondent has been actively registering domain names in the past years, as it can be seen from the various cases where he has been a respondent. The Panel also has no serious doubt (albeit in the absence of any Response) that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present its case, and so that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition, the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

6.2 Substantive Matters

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 other terms "cookware" 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 finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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.

The Respondent's conduct demonstrates the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. By registering the disputed domain name and then by using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant, demonstrates that the Respondent specifically knew of and targeted the Complainant.

The Respondent is not associated with the Complainant.

The Respondent provided no explanation as to why he selected the Complainant's PIGEON trademark for the disputed domain name.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent selected and used the disputed domain name because of the reputation of the Complainant to attract Internet users but then divert these users to the Amazon website so that the Respondent could receive commission payments from Amazon. In the present circumstances, the fact that the disputed domain name resolves to a website which impersonates the Complainant and that copies the Complainant's logo, and that then diverts Internet users to the Amazon website, is conclusive evidence that the registration and use of the disputed domain name was in bad faith.

The Respondent has been found to be involved in at least nine (9) trademark-abusive domain name registrations (e.g., *DDP Specialty Electronic Materials US, LLC v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3033](#); *Fridababy, LLC v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3565](#); *Fridababy LLC. v. Vladimir Veselovskiy*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3224](#)).

In the view of the Panel, this behavior demonstrates a pattern of conduct by the Respondent and further supports a finding of the Respondent's bad faith. Previous UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2. The Panel considers that this is the case here.

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 <pigeoncookware.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: June 1, 2026.