

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

GCI OUTDOOR LLC v. ZHEN

Case No. D2026-2086

1. The Parties

The Complainant is GCI OUTDOOR LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Dentons Durham Jones Pinegar P.C., United States.

The Respondent is ZHEN, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gcioutdoorshop.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 May 14, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 16, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on June 11, 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 GCI OUTDOOR LLC, a company organised under the laws of Delaware, United States.

The Complainant operates in the outdoor products sector. The record indicates that its business includes portable outdoor furniture, including seats, chairs, stools, and tables.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registration:

GCI (figurative) – United States – registration number 7748695 – registered April 1, 2025.

The Complainant operates an official website at the domain name <gcioutdoor.com>, through which it presents and offers its outdoor products.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 18, 2026.

The record shows that the disputed domain name resolves to an active e-commerce website purporting to offer outdoor furniture and related products. The website displays product names corresponding to those used for GCI Outdoor products, including various outdoor chairs and accessories. The website also uses the expression “GCI Outdoor” in the copyright notice in its footer and displays contact details using an email address associated with the disputed domain name.

The Respondent appears to be located in China. No further information regarding the Respondent is available in the record. The Respondent did not submit a Response.

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 its GCI mark because it incorporates the verbal element GCI in its entirety, together with the terms “outdoor” and “shop”, and the generic Top-Level Domain “.com”. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is not authorised to use the Complainant’s mark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has used the disputed domain name for a commercial website impersonating or suggesting affiliation with the Complainant. Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith, asserting that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and used it to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

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 entirety of the textual element of the mark is reproduced 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](#), sections 1.7 and 1.10.

Although the addition of other terms, such as "outdoor" and "shop" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overvie 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.

Based on the available record, Respondent was not authorized to use the GCI mark or to register a domain name incorporating that mark. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name combines the Complainant's GCI mark with the terms "outdoor" and "shop". In the circumstances of this case, those additional terms are apt to refer to the Complainant's field of activity and to its outdoor products online sale efforts. The composition of the disputed domain name coupled with its use for a website in which the Respondent tries to pass itself off as the Complainant, therefore signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

The record shows that the disputed domain name resolved to an e-commerce website purporting to offer outdoor furniture and related products, including products identified by names corresponding to those used for the Complainant's products. The website also used the expression "GCI Outdoor" in the copyright notice, presented products at substantially discounted prices, and mimicked the overall look and feel of the Complainant's official website. Such use is not consistent with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant had obtained registered rights in the GCI mark.

The disputed domain name incorporates the GCI mark and combines it with the terms “outdoor” and “shop”. The Panel considers that these terms are not incidental in the present circumstances. They refer to the Complainant’s area of business and to an online retail context. The composition of the disputed domain name therefore supports an inference that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name.

That inference is reinforced by the use made of the disputed domain name. The associated website purported to offer outdoor furniture and related products, including products identified by names corresponding to those used for the Complainant’s products. It also used the expression “GCI Outdoor” in the copyright notice, displayed product listings at substantially discounted prices, and presented itself as an online store for such products, mimicking the overall look and feel of the Complainant’s official website. On the record before it, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent selected and uses the disputed domain name to create a false impression of association with the Complainant.

The Panel considers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website associated with the disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s GCI mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Respondent has provided no explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, 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 <gcioutdoorshop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Cappai/

Andrea Cappai

Sole Panelist

Date: June 29, 2026