

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Asket AB v. 杨燕梅 (yang yan mei)

Case No. D2026-1981

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Asket AB, Sweden, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is 杨燕梅 (yang yan mei), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <asketnederland.com>, <asketnorge.com>, and <asketuk.com> are registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2026. On May 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 14, 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 amendment to the Complaint in English on May 18, 2026.

On May 14, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On May 18, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 the Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Douglas Clark as the sole panelist in this matter on June 22, 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 Stockholm, Sweden founded in 2015. The Complainant operates a business selling clothing under the trademark ASKET in physical shops and online.

The Complainant owns a number of domain names, through which it sells its products, that incorporate the trademark ASKET, such as <asket.com>, <asket.nl>, <asket.uk>, and <asket.co.uk>.

The Complainant is the registered proprietor of the trademark ASKET in a number of jurisdictions:

- European Union Trade mark Registration No. 014244461 for ASKET (word mark), registered on May 6, 2017 in Class 25;
- International Registration No. 1366796 for ASKET (word mark), registered on August 16, 2017 in Class 25, designating, inter alia, China, Norway, and Switzerland;
- International Registration No. 1498044 for ASKET (word mark), registered on September 23, 2019 in Classes 9, 18, 25, and 35, designating, inter alia, Australia, China, Japan, Republic of Korea, Norway, Switzerland, and United States of America;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00917120783 for ASKET (combined mark), registered on November 30, 2017 in Class 25; and
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00918040902 for ASKET (word mark), registered on July 24, 2019 in Classes 9, 18, 25 and 35.

The disputed domain names were registered on March 10, 2026. The disputed domain names resolve to websites purportedly offering ASKET products for sale. The website to which <asketnederland.com> resolves is in Dutch, the website to which <asketnorge.com> resolves is in Norwegian, and the website to which <asketuk.com> resolves is in English. The websites use the Complainant's ASKET trademark and branding.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; and (iii) the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith, including by using them to host websites displaying the Complainant's trademark and seeking to unfairly profit from the Complainant's name, reputation and rights by hosting websites designed to impersonate the Complainant's company and e-commerce website at "www.asket.com".

The Complainant submits that it has no affiliation with the Respondent, nor has it authorized the Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes the Complainant's marks, and that the Respondent has no

rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. Rather, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring the disputed domain names, when the Respondent knew of the Complainant's rights. The Complainant also states that the products offered on the websites are either counterfeits, illegally obtained or do not exist.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English.

No Response was filed with the Center.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.5.1).

In this regard, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names consist of a trademark in Latin characters, that the website associated with <asketuk.com> is available only in English, and that the Respondent has not objected to the Complainant's request regarding the language of the proceeding. Furthermore, it would be cumbersome, costly, and delay the process, if the Complainant would be required to translate the Complaint into Chinese.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In the present case, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The Panel finds that the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's ASKET mark in its entirety, with the addition of the terms "nederland", "norge" and "uk" respectively which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds that 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.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain names resolve to websites purportedly offering products bearing the Complainant's mark. Even assuming that the products offered are genuine, in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), the panel held that to be bona fide within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the offering should meet the following requirements:

- The Respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- The Respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods; otherwise, it could be using the trademark to bait Internet users and then switch them to other goods;
- The site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark owner; it may not, for example, falsely suggest that it is the trademark owner, or that the website is the official site; and
- The Respondent must not try to corner the market in all domain names, thus depriving the trademark owner of reflecting its own mark in a domain name.

In this case the Respondent does not meet at least the third requirement set out above. The Complainant has never consented to the Respondent's use of the mark and logo. The websites under the disputed domain names do not accurately and prominently disclose the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation or passing off, 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.

The Respondent used the Complainant's prior registered trademarks and branding to create websites that falsely purport to be official online shops of the Complainant, offering the Complainant's products for sale. According to the Complainant, the websites reproduce the Complainant's color scheme, logo, and product

images, which has not been objected by the Respondent. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has intentionally used the disputed domain names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the websites under the disputed domain names by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, 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 names <asketnederland.com>, <asketnorge.com>, and <asketuk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Douglas Clark/

Douglas Clark

Sole Panelist

Date: July 8, 2026