

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Spinrite Inc. v. Yan Wenming
Case No. D2026-1843

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Spinrite Inc., Canada, represented by Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP, Canada.

The Respondent is Yan Wenming, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <yarnspirationsa.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 29, 2026. On April 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 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 (Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 1, 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 4, 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 June 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Angelica Lodigiani as the sole panelist in this matter on June 5, 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 was founded in 1952 in Canada and operates as a yarn manufacturer and seller in Canada and the United States of America ("United States").

The Complainant's craft knitting yarns and related products are offered for sale under its registered trademarks CARON and BERNAT through its website at "www.yarnspirations.com".

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for YARNSPIRATIONS:

- YARNSPIRATIONS (word), Canadian registration No. TMA1057722, registered on October 7, 2019, covering goods in classes 16, 23 and 26 and services in class 35, claiming a first use in commerce on services in September 2013;

- YARNSPIRATIONS (word), United States registration No. 6392155, registered on June 22, 2021, covering goods and services in classes 16, 23, 26, 35 and 42, claiming a first use in commerce in September 2013;

- YARNSPIRATIONS (word), Australian registration No. 2475193, registered on August 19, 2024, covering goods and services in classes 9, 16, 23, 26 and 35.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain names <yarnspirations.com>, registered on April 15, 2013, and used to promote and sell its products, and <spinriteyarns.com>, which is used as the Complainant's corporate website.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 29, 2026, allegedly by an individual residing in China. It resolves to a website purporting to be an online store offering for sale the Complainant's products at discounted prices, prominently featuring the Complainant's YARNSPIRATIONS figurative mark and copyright notice, along with others of its registered trademarks.

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 YARNSPIRATIONS trademark. The disputed domain name is a misspelling of the YARNSPIRATIONS mark as it consists of this mark followed by a letter "a".

The Complainant further maintains that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

There has never been any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Respondent is not licensed or otherwise authorized to register or use the YARNSPIRATIONS mark in any manner whatsoever, including as part of the disputed domain name or in connection with its website, as described below.

The dispute domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the YARNSPIRATIONS mark and other marks of the Complainant, as well as content and product images taken from the Complainant's official website.

At the bottom of each of the webpages of the Respondent's website is a copyright notice stating: "Copyright© 2026 Spinrite, Inc. All rights reserved", together with an email address corresponding to the disputed domain name, as well as a postal address and telephone numbers in the United States. On the Respondent's website the Respondent offers for sale purported Complainant's products at discounted prices. Before completing a purchase, customers are required to provide personal and confidential information such as their name, address, and credit card details. The Respondent's website also contains a contact form requesting the same confidential information.

The Complainant maintains that, through the disputed domain name, the Respondent is impersonating the Complainant and creating the false impression that the Respondent's website is associated or affiliated with the Complainant, when in fact this is not the case.

Accordingly, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to its website and solicit personal information and credit card information, through the Respondent's online store and contact forms available on the website. Such use cannot be considered legitimate, noncommercial, or fair, and does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent in respect of the disputed domain name.

As far as bad faith is concerned, the Complainant maintains that its YARNSPIRATIONS mark enjoys reputation in Canada and in the United States. In light of this and of the use made of the disputed domain name, it is unconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and of its YARNSPIRATIONS mark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to fraudulently represent itself as the Complainant, thereby misleading Internet users and diverting them to its website. The Respondent is thus attempting to take unfair advantage of the goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark for commercial gain.

The Respondent is also seeking to obtain personal and confidential information from Internet users visiting its website as part of a fraudulent scheme, such as phishing or other scams. Such use of the disputed domain name is likely to damage the goodwill associated with the Complainant's YARNSPIRATIONS mark and cause serious disruption to the Complainant's business.

Finally, the fact that the Respondent has concealed its identity behind a privacy shield is, according to the Complainant, a further indication of bad faith.

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. In particular, the Complainant has shown that it owns registered rights over the YARNSPIRATIONS trademark.

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. The disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant's mark as it consists of the same trademark with a letter "a" added at its end. According to section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), UDRP panels generally consider a domain name, which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting), to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element.

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 Complainant states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to register or use the YARNSPIRATIONS mark in any manner whatsoever. Nothing in the case file indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's mark, differing only by the addition of the letter "a" at the end, which is likely to go unnoticed. Moreover, the disputed domain name directs Internet users to a website that makes prominent use of the YARNSPIRATIONS figurative mark together with additional trademarks belonging to the Complainant. The website also incorporates material and product images copied from the Complainant's official website. Each page of the Respondent's website displays a copyright notice reading: "Copyright@ 2026 Spinrite, Inc. All rights reserved", along with an email address corresponding to the disputed domain name, as well as a purporting mailing address and telephone numbers located in the United States. Finally, the Respondent's website does not contain any disclaimer clarifying its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

Overall, the website associated with the disputed domain name creates an impermissible risk of user confusion through passing off; it is highly misleading, as it conveys to Internet users the false impression that is a website originating from the Complainant, whereas in fact it is not.

On the Respondent's website, the Respondent offers for sale alleged Complainant's products at a discounted price. To finalize any transaction, customers are required to disclose personal and sensitive data, including their name, address, and credit card information. In addition, the website features a contact form through which the same confidential information is requested.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that through the disputed domain name and the corresponding website, the Respondent is seeking to mislead and divert Internet users to its website for illegitimate commercial gain and to obtain personal and confidential information, presumably for malicious purposes.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as the one described above, 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 was likely aware of the Complainant's mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered a domain name consisting of a common, obvious and intentional misspelling of the Complainant's mark. The YARNSPIRATIONS mark consists of a fanciful word that is distinctive and is exclusively associated with the Complainant. The disputed domain name resolves to a misleading website, offering for sale products purported to be those of the Complainant and seeking to obtain personal and confidential information from Internet users, including their credit card data. The website features the Complainant's YARNSPIRATIONS mark in the exact same figurative form as it appears on the Complainant's official website. Notwithstanding that the Respondent is an individual in China, the website provides a United States mailing address and telephone number, presumably to enhance its credibility, given that the United States is one of the Complainant's principal markets. The Respondent's website also features other registered trademarks of the Complainant.

All these circumstances clearly demonstrate the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant's activities and mark and that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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 <yarnspirationsa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angelica Lodigiani/

Angelica Lodigiani

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2026