

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Oriental Trading Company, Inc. v. hang yue  
Case No. D2026-1651

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Oriental Trading Company, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is hang yue, China.

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

The disputed domain name <orientaltrading-co.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 17, 2026. On April 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 21, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 21, 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 on April 22, 2026.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Emre Kerim Yardimci as the sole panelist in this matter on June 1, 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 company based in Omaha, Nebraska, United States, which was founded in 1932, and which subsequently grew into one of the major suppliers of party supplies, toys, fundraising products and crafting goods in the United States. Today, the Complainant operates as an e-retailer and cataloger of party supplies, arts, crafts, school supplies, toys and novelties, through its official website “www.orientaltrading.com”.

According to the material submitted together with the Complaint, the Complainant has been recognized as a leader in its industry and as one of the top 50 Internet retailers and Catalog companies.

The Complainant is the owner of:

- the Canada trademark No. TMA522030 for ORIENTAL TRADING (registered on January 21, 2000)
- the United States trademark No. 1754376 for ORIENTAL TRADING (registered on February 23, 1993)
- the United States trademark No. 7,048,907 for ORIENTAL TRADING (registered on May 9, 2023)

The disputed domain name was registered on September 8, 2025, and at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name was resolving to an active website impersonating the Complainant's 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 the Complainant's well-known trademark ORIENTAL TRADING trademark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety, and that the addition of the term “-co” does not lessen the association between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant considers that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, mainly because the Complainant has neither licensed nor otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its marks or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the trademark ORIENTAL TRADING.

Lastly, the Complainant says that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It is evident that the Respondent had full knowledge of the Complainant's rights in its mark given the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name, which uses its ORIENTAL TRADING mark in its entirety, and the Respondent's use of a website which displayed the Complainant's official logo, and using a similar color scheme to that of the Complainant.

The Complainant, therefore, claims that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name with the aim to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and for the purpose of disrupting the Complainant's business and targeting the Complainant's trademark and its clients.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that;

- (i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of the abbreviation "-co" - which is often an abbreviation of the word "company" - may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such addition 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.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

As regards the generic Top-Level Domain, it is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test.

For the reasons mentioned above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ORIENTAL TRADING trademark.

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.

In addition, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the abbreviation "co" carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Lastly, several panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as copycat site can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 accepts the Complainant's assertions that the trademark ORIENTAL TRADING is a well-known trademark.

The incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name by a registrant having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith (*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); *General Electric Company v. CPIC NET and Hussain Syed*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0087](#); *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#)).

The Complainant's trademark had been registered for not less than 30 years at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website impersonating the Complainant. This impersonation consisted of a website which displayed the Complainant's official logo and used a similar color scheme to that of the Complainant. This corroborates the fact that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademark in mind at the time of its registration.

Given the Respondent's lack of participation in this proceeding, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the use of the disputed domain name for a website that displayed the Complainant's trademarks, the Panel finds that 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 products on the website, 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 <orientaltrading-co.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Emre Kerim Yardimci/*

**Emre Kerim Yardimci**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2026