

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

JPW Industries Inc. v. Bin Ji
Case No. D2026-1983

1. The Parties

The Complainant is JPW Industries Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Holland & Knight, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Bin Ji, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jetshop-us.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2026. On May 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 11, 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 (Ben Ji) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 15, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on May 15, 2026.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on June 9, 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 1960, is headquartered in the United States and operates a retail business specializing in designing, manufacturing and providing tools, tools accessories and other material-handling products under the JET trademark.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE
JET	United States	713132	March 28, 1961
JET (logo)	United States	3627037	May 26, 2009
JET	International Registration	806142	October 23, 2002

The Complainant holds the domain name <jettools.com> which has been used since 1996 and hosts its main website.

The Respondent did not file a Response. Therefore, not much is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 16, 2022.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo and purporting to offer JET branded tools and accessories, thereby also reproducing product images from 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 as follows:

The trademark JET has been extensively used for decades to identify the Complainant and its products. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the JET trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the terms "shop" and "us" is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent's use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark JET at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, by reproducing elements of the Complainant's website to lure visitors to its website and provide their personal and financial information.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms such as here "shop" and "us" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms do 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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 for a complainant to prove 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 Panel is mindful that the term “jet” has a dictionary meaning. In the present case, the fact that the Respondent used the Complainant’s trademark and logo on the website posted under the disputed domain name to offer the same products as offered by the Complainant clearly shows that the Respondent is not using the term “jet” according to its dictionary meaning, but seeks to target the Complainant and its trademark.

The Complainant has shown that the Respondent posted a website under the disputed domain name purporting to offer the Complainant’s products. The record does not show whether the Respondent actually resells the Complainant’s genuine products, or whether it sells counterfeit products, or whether it merely lures visitors in order to obtain their personal and financial information. In any event, even if the Respondent were to actually offer the Complainant’s genuine products, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not meet the “Okidata Test”, established in *Okidata Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), because the website does not disclose the lack of relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8 and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.

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 record shows that the website posted under the disputed domain name impersonates the Complainant by using the Complainant’s trademark and logo and images copied from its official website. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as here impersonating the Complainant, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Based on the available record, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant’s trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the Complainant’s trademark is well-known and that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant’s trademark and logo as well as materials copied from the Complainant’s website, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s well-known trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The impression given by this website would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name to post a website impersonating the Complainant, 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 its website in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <jetshop-us.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: June 23, 2026