

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Integrated Label Corporation v. Leo Wollner
Case No. D2026-1483

1. The Parties

Complainant is Integrated Label Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c., United States.

Respondent is Leo Wollner, United States, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <integratedforms.com> (the "Domain Name") 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 April 7, 2026. On April 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 8, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 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 Responses were filed with the Center on April 17, 21, and 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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

Complainant is incorporated in the State of Illinois, United States. According to Complainant:

“Complainant is well-known in the United States for producing a variety of high-quality business forms and labels (the “INTEGRATED Goods”). Complainant uses “INTEGRATED FORMS” in connection with the business forms it markets and sells in the U.S. and abroad. Complainant has provided high-quality products to numerous customers in the U.S. and around the globe.”

Complainant holds a trademark registration with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) for the mark INTEGRATED FORMS, USPTO Reg. No. 3,271,923, registered on July 31, 2007 in connection with “business forms” with an August 1, 1999 date of first use in commerce. Complainant also holds a trademark registration for the mark INTEGRATED LABELS, USPTO Reg. No. 4,300,784, registered on March 12, 2013 in connection with “business forms” with a July 9, 1999 date of first use in commerce.

Complainant has owned the domain name <integratedlabels.com> since 1999, and uses that domain name to host its commercial website.

According to corporate filings and a Dunn & Bradstreet report annexed to the Complaint, Respondent is the owner of Quality Paper Corporation, an entity organized under the laws of the State of New York, United States.

According to Complainant, Respondent has long been aware of Complainant and its trademarks, as Respondent’s company has been a customer of Complainant for years. Annexed to the Complaint are summaries of sales of Complainant’s products to Quality Paper Corporation from 2004 to 2025. The list shows more than a thousand transactions over that period. Also annexed to the Complaint are several invoices reflecting some of these transactions.

The Domain Name was registered on May 26, 2025. For a time, the Domain Name resolved to a website describing Respondent as “your trusted leader in INTEGRATED FORMS and LABELS.” According to Complainant:

“Respondent uses the Disputed Domain Name in an attempt to pass itself off as Complainant by incorporating INTEGRATED FORMS into the Disputed Domain Name and using the Complainant’s INTEGRATED FORMS Trademark prominently on Respondent’s products for sale throughout the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name.”

Complainant alleges further:

“A number of the product names on Respondent’s Website are identical to those displayed on Complainant’s Website. The identical names include for example, “INTEGRATED FORMS”, “INTEGRATED LABELS”, “INTEGRATED CARDS.” The respondent’s prominent use of the Complainant’s “INTEGRATED FORMS”, “INTEGRATED LABELS”, “INTEGRATED CARDS Trademarks on Respondent’s website and Respondent’s use of INTEGRATED FORMS in the Disputed Domain Name creates the false impression that the Complainant endorses, approves, or is affiliated with, Respondent’s business.”

Respondent admits that his company has been a customer of Complainant for more than 20 years. Respondent states, however, that in all his dealings with Complainant, the latter never used the trademark INTEGRATED FORMS in communications with, or invoices to, Respondent. Respondent notes that all the invoices annexed to the Complaint use Integrated Label Corporation exclusively, and never INTEGRATED FORMS.

Respondent asserts further:

“I have been selling the product known as “integrated forms” and integrated labels for over 20 years. This is the common industry name for the product, and I have always used it in good faith.”

On August 26, 2025, Respondent filed an application with the USPTO to register the mark INTEGRATEDFORMS, USPTO Serial No. 99357740. This application is pending, though the USPTO has issued a final Office action refusing registration.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent asserts that he registered the Domain Name in good faith to use in connection with his company’s business of selling labels and forms. Although Respondent had dealings with Complainant for more than 20 years, he was unaware of Complainant’s INTEGRATED FORMS mark because Complainant never used that trademark in his business dealings with Respondent. Rather, Complainant held itself out as Integrated Label Corporation and used INTEGRATED LABELS in all communications with, and invoices to, Respondent.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that Complainant has rights in the trademark INTEGRATED FORMS through registration demonstrated in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Name is identical to that mark.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel need not address this element, given its finding below with respect to the “bad faith” element.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, “in particular but without limitation,” are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in “bad faith”:

- (i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
- (ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on Respondent’s website or location.

The Panel concludes, on the record provided here, that Complainant has failed to carry its burden of proving that Respondent registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith.

This is an unusual case inasmuch as the Parties have known each other for decades, and yet Respondent plausibly claims that he was not aware of Complainant’s INTEGRATED FORMS trademark during that relationship. There is no doubt that Complainant has owned a registered trademark for INTEGRATED FORMS for nearly 20 years. On the record presented here, however, Complainant has failed to provide any evidence that Respondent was aware of that mark. As Respondent correctly points out, the numerous invoices from Complainant to Respondent that are annexed to the Complaint refer to Complainant as Integrated Label Corporation and use the mark INTEGRATED LABELS. A review of Complainant’s current website also shows that Complainant does not currently use INTEGRATED FORMS prominently as a mark on its own website. In other words, other than the trademark registration itself, there is no evidence in the record that Complainant has used INTEGRATED FORMS as a source identifier for its goods.

Respondent contends that “integrated forms” is a generic term in the industry and hence cannot be protected under United States trademark law. The Panel need not examine this proposition. The Panel observes, though, that INTEGRATED FORMS is not a fanciful trademark (featuring a coined word) or an arbitrary mark (where the words in the mark bear no relationship at all to the product or service being sold). Put another way, the mark INTEGRATED FORMS is not so inherently distinctive that one must infer that someone in Respondent’s position was likely aware of that mark at the time he registered the Domain Name.

In sum, while it raises unanswered questions why Respondent registered the particular form of the disputed domain name only recently after years of the Parties working together and while he says he was not aware that the Complainant asserted the same as a trademark, neither does Respondent state that he conducted a search, Respondent has put forth a sufficiently plausible explanation for having registered the Domain Name without knowledge of Complainant’s INTEGRATED FORMS mark. Complainant has the burden of proof in this proceeding, and in the Panel’s view Complainant has failed to carry that burden.

It is of course beyond the scope of this UDRP proceeding to consider whether Complainant has a viable cause of action in a court of law under federal trademark law.

The Complaint fails.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Robert A. Badgley/

Robert A. Badgley

Sole Panelist

Date: May 31, 2026