ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Leatherman Tool Group, Inc. v. Dillon Young, Dillon Young
Case No. D2026-1839

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Leatherman Tool Group, Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Dillon Young, Dillon Young, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <leathersmans.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 29, 2026. On April 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 5, 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 May 5, 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 May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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, Leatherman Tool Group Inc., was founded in 1983 in the United States by Timothy Leatherman and Steve Berliner. The Complainant provides multi-purpose tools. The initial "Leatherman" tool was called the Pocket Survival Tool ("PST"). The PST comprised of 13 different tools and folded up into a five-ounce, four-inch toolbox. This product successfully went to market with 30,000 sold in the first year. The Complainant expanded to selling over one million PST multi-tools over the next decade. Currently, "Leatherman" tools are sold and used across the Complainant's home country of the United States, as well as internationally. The Complainant's official website is "leatherman.com" which is used to advertise and sell its goods (Annex 4). The Complainant's products are also featured on popular marketplaces, such as Amazon and have established brands as authorized resellers, such as Cotswold Outdoor and Multi-Tool Store. Such extensive exposure of the "Leatherman" brand and products has led to the Complainant obtaining both national and international recognition in the multi-tool market.

The Complainant owns trademarks in numerous jurisdictions, including but not limited to LEATHERMAN U.S. Registration No 1325473, registered March 19, 1985, in class 8; LEATHERMAN U.S. Registration No. 2596689, registered July 23, 2002, in class 25; and LEATHERMAN European Union Registration No. 000041731, registered March 31, 2004, in classes 18, 25 and 28.

The Complainant registered the domain name of its official website, <leatherman.com>, on October 19, 1995. According to public traffic statistics, the website receives an average of 1.1 million visits per month (as of September 2025) from users around the world including, for example, from the United States, Canada, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom.

In addition to trademarks, the Complainant has also registered several other domain names featuring the LEATHERMAN trademark, with the sole purpose of allowing their customers to access and use their services from all around the world. A non-exhaustive list of the Complainant's domain names includes, but is not limited to: <leatherman.ca>, <leatherman.be>, <leatherman.cn>, <leatherman.co.uk> and <leatherman.mx>, many of which redirect to the official "Leatherman" platform.

The Respondent currently uses the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that impersonates the "Leatherman" brand, using the trademark and official logo, and allegedly selling the Complainant's products at discounted prices The Respondent's use of content from the Complainant's official website (e.g. product images), whilst purporting to offer LEATHERMAN products, gives Internet users the false impression that the site is controlled or authorized by the Complainant. Further, throughout the site, Internet users are encouraged to "login", "contact us" and "sign up for email", where it is requested that they enter personal information such as their email address. When attempting to purchase an item, the "checkout" area requires that users input more sensitive information, including their full name, address, email address, phone number and card details.

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 Respondent currently uses the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that impersonates the "Leatherman" brand, using the trademark and official logo, and allegedly selling the Complainant's products at discounted prices. The Respondent's use of content from the Complainant's official website (e.g. product images), whilst purporting to offer "Leatherman" products, gives Internet users the false impression that the site is controlled or authorized by the Complainant. Further, throughout the site, Internet users are encouraged to "login", "contact us" and "sign up for email", where it is requested that they enter personal information such as their email address. When attempting to purchase an item, the "checkout" area requires that users input more sensitive information, including their full name, address, email address, phone number and card details.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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. 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, two additional "s" letters, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letters 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed phishing/identity theft, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud, 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 notes that the Respondent's use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed phishing/identity theft, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. 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 <leathersmans.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/
Elizabeth Ann Morgan
Sole Panelist
Date: June 20, 2026