ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
ATG Ceylon (Pvt) Limited v. David Sokolov
Case No. D2026-1871

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ATG Ceylon (Pvt) Limited, Sri Lanka, represented by Barker Brettell LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is David Sokolov, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maxiflex-gloves.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 30, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to the Complainant on May 7, 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 12, 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Erica Aoki as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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 incorporated in Sri Lanka and a member of the ATG group of companies.

Founded in 1992, the Complainant is a leading manufacturer and supplier of industrial and protective gloves, distributing its products worldwide through an extensive network of authorized distributors and commercial partners.

The Complainant has used the trademark MAXIFLEX in connection with protective gloves since at least 2003 and has developed substantial goodwill and reputation in that mark through extensive international use and promotion.

The Complainant owns trademark rights in MAXIFLEX, including, among others:

• United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK0002350050B for MAXIFLEX, filed on November 21, 2003, and registered on May 21, 2004;

• European Union Trademark Registration No. 005960992 for MAXIFLEX, filed on May 23, 2007, and registered on April 17, 2008;

• United States of America Trademark Registration No. 4382045 for MAXIFLEX, filed on February 7, 2012, and registered on August 13, 2013.

These trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name and remain valid and in force.

The Complainant also operates domain names incorporating its MAXIFLEX trademark and uses such domain names in connection with the promotion and sale of its products worldwide.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 5, 2024.

According to the record, the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark and product images. The website reproduced images associated with the Complainant and its authorized distributors, referred to the Complainant's ATG name, and displayed the Complainant's address, creating the impression that the website was operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied all three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its MAXIFLEX trademark.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark in its entirety and merely adds the term "gloves", which directly refers to the products for which the Complainant's trademark is used.

According to the Complainant, the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and instead reinforces the impression that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant and its products.

Second, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has never been authorized or licensed to use the MAXIFLEX trademark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a website displaying the Complainant's trademark, product images, company address, and references to the ATG name cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Third, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the longstanding use and reputation of the MAXIFLEX trademark, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent intentionally used the disputed domain name to create a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement by reproducing the Complainant's trademark and commercial materials and presenting a website that falsely appeared to be associated with the Complainant. According to the Complainant, such conduct demonstrates an intentional attempt to capitalize on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's trademark and constitutes evidence of bad-faith registration and use under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under 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;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Procedural Issue – Location of the Respondent

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 also that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The location of the Respondent disclosed by the Registrar appears to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification. It is therefore 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 the proceeding should continue. The record shows that Notification of Complaint email was sent to the Respondent's email address disclosed by the Registrar. The Center's notification in postal form sent to the Respondent's mailing address as disclosed by the Registrar is reported to have been notified for collection in Ukraine on May 28, 2026. However, the record shows the delivery as unsuccessful because the recipient was not present.

In any event, the Center has fulfilled its notice obligations under the Rules and the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present its case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

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 Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated rights in the MAXIFLEX trademark through its registered trademark rights.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term "gloves" does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from remaining clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Panels have consistently held that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of descriptive or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8).

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity test (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark.

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 a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests with the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may involve the difficult task of proving a negative, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent.

Accordingly, where a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating such rights or legitimate interests. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

According to the record, the disputed domain name was used in connection with a website prominently displaying the Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark, reproducing images of the Complainant's products, referring to the Complainant's ATG name, displaying the Complainant's address, and reproducing content associated with the Complainant and its authorized distributors. Such use creates a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant and does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation, passing off, or other deceptive conduct can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1).

The Respondent has not submitted any Response or evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing or to demonstrate any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark is distinctive and has been used for many years in connection with the Complainant's protective glove business. The Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. In light of the Complainant's longstanding use of the MAXIFLEX trademark and its international commercial presence, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark in its entirety together with the descriptive term "gloves", which directly corresponds to the products sold under the Complainant's trademark. Rather than distinguishing the disputed domain name from the Complainant's mark, this addition reinforces the impression that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant and its business.

The record demonstrates that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to host a website displaying images of the Complainant's products, reproducing content associated with the Complainant and its authorized distributors, referring to the Complainant's ATG name, and displaying the Complainant's address. These circumstances establish that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and deliberately targeted the Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark notwithstanding the Parties' different locations.

The record further shows that the disputed domain name was used for a website that reproduced the Complainant's trademark and commercial materials in a manner likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the website was operated, endorsed, or authorized by the Complainant. Such conduct constitutes impersonation and passing off.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation, passing off, or other deceptive conduct constitutes evidence of bad faith under the Policy (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4). In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's MAXIFLEX trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. Such conduct constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not submitted any Response or otherwise provided any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name. In the absence of any plausible good-faith explanation, the Respondent's failure to participate in the proceeding further supports an inference of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <maxiflex-gloves.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Erica Aoki/
Erica Aoki
Sole Panelist
Date: June 19, 2026