ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Karsten Manufacturing Corporation v. bunal bunal
Case No. D2026-2087

1. The Parties

Complainant is Karsten Manufacturing Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Elster & McGrady LLC, United States.

Respondent is bunal bunal, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pinggolfpro.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (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 17, 2027, 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 ("The RDAP server redacted the value") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 19, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 22, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 15, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on June 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Bradley A. Slutsky as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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

According to the Complaint and Complainant's trademark registrations, Complainant "adopted and commenced use of its PING® mark in commerce in connection with golf clubs, golf equipment, and related goods and services" at least as early as January, 1959. The Annexes to the Complaint contain two of Complainant's United States trademark registrations for PING, as follows:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Reg. No.	Reg. Date	Int'l Class(es)	Goods / Services
PING	United States	704,552	September 20, 1960	28	Golf clubs
PING	United States	1,632,445	January 22, 1991	28	Golf bags, golf balls, and head covers for golf clubs

Complainant operates a website at "www.ping.com" and, notably, this site contains pages dedicated to Complainant's PING i240 golf irons.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 9, 2026. Respondent's website at the disputed domain name prominently displays a PING i240 iron, and offers visitors the purported opportunity to purchase discounted PING golf clubs, golf bags, and head covers. The Complaint also asserts that this website "uses the PING Mark and Ping branding, including its design mark, font, favicon, photos, and color scheme."

The registrar identified Respondent as "bunal bunal" located on "Frum Street" in Nashville, Tennessee, United States.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's PING mark[1] in that the disputed domain name consists of the PING mark "in combination with the industry-related terms 'golf' and 'pro'", plus the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", none of which dispels confusing similarity. Complainant also asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a website that allegedly will confuse Internet users into believing Respondent's website is authorized by or affiliated with Complainant, and "[s]uch impersonation does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the [d]isputed [d]omain" name. Respondent also asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because Respondent is using the disputed domain name "to attract customers for commercial gain by capitalizing on the likelihood of confusion with Complainant's PING Mark", and because "Complainant has not granted Respondent any license, permission, or authorization by which it could own or

[1] Complainant asserts that "[t]he PING mark has been found famous in connection with golf-related equipment and services", citing *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Pingel*, 2011 TTAB LEXIS 454 (Trademark Trial & App. Bd. June 22, 2011). No other evidence of fame was presented in the Complaint or its Annexes. While the Panel is aware of Complainant's golf equipment, the Panel notes that the *Karsten* decision is non-precedential, https://ttabvue.uspto.gov/ttabvue/ttabvue-91189542-OPP-51.pdf.

use any domain name registration, which is confusingly similar to the PING Mark." Complainant also notes that Respondent is known as bunal bunal, and "Respondent has never been commonly known as 'pinggolfpro.com' and has never used any trademark or service mark similar to the [d]isputed [d]omain [name] by which they may have come to be known other than the infringing use noted herein." Complainant observes that Respondent's registered contact address purports to be on "Frum Street" in Nashville, Tennessee, United States, and that this address appears to be false "which is further indicative that Respondent had no rights or legitimate interests in the [d]isputed [d]omain" name. Complainant also contends that "Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [d]isputed [d]omain [name] as the website is advertising apparent counterfeit PING products, is not a legitimate channel of distribution and is not owned by any authorized distributor of Complainant", that none of the *Oki Data* conditions are present here, and that the sale of counterfeit goods does not constitute a legitimate interest. Finally, Complainant asserts that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith because the terms that have been added to Complainant's PING mark ("golf" and "pro") imply affiliation with Complainant, Respondent's website uses Complainant's branding and purports to sell Complainant's products (without a license), Respondent was aware of Complainant's PING mark when Respondent registered and used the mark in the disputed domain name, Respondent is attempting to attract Internet users to Respondent's website for commercial gain by impersonating Complainant and creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's PING mark, and Respondent allegedly used false contact information.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, a panel in UDRP proceedings "shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant must prove the following:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and

(ii) 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 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.

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 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, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "golf" and "pro", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does 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.

Further, a gTLD "is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test." WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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

"Any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be proved based on its evaluation of all evidence presented, shall demonstrate [Respondent's] rights or legitimate interests to the domain name for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii):

(i) before any notice to [Respondent] of the dispute, [Respondent's] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) [has] been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [Respondent has] acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) [Respondent is] making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue". Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

"Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods […], passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent", WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1, and that "circumstantial evidence can support a complainant's otherwise credible claim of illegal respondent activity." WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1. "Evidence that the goods are offered disproportionately below market value, […] that the images of the goods prima facie suggest (e.g., where the relevant logo is distorted) that they are not genuine, that the respondent has misappropriated copyrighted images from the complainant's website, […] or that a respondent has improperly concealed its identity (whether on the website or in the registrar's RDAP (formerly WhoIs information)[])] to avoid being contactable, have each been found relevant in this regard." Id.

Here, there is no evidence that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, Respondent is using the disputed domain name to purportedly offer Complainant's products at a 70% discount, using Complainant's mark, font, favicon, photos, and color scheme. There also is no evidence that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. Respondent apparently is known as "bunal bunal". The use that Respondent is making of the disputed domain name also is a commercial use (selling PING golf clubs, golf bags, head covers, and other PING items) and is not a fair use. The lack of any license from Complainant to Respondent also supports a finding of no rights or legitimate interests, as does the fact that Respondent apparently used false contact information[2] in registering the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, 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. Specifically, "the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that [Respondent has] registered or [Respondent has] acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [Respondent's] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) [Respondent has] registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [Respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) [Respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, [Respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [Respondent's] web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [Respondent's] web site or location or of a product or service on [Respondent's] web site or location." Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent registered a domain name that incorporates Complainant's trademark followed by two terms – "golf" and "pro" – that are emblematic of Complainant's goods, and then created a website at that domain name that contains Complainant's photos of Complainant's goods and offers to sell those goods at a 70% discount. Thus, Respondent was aware of Complainant's trademark and registered and used it to "intentionally attempt[] to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [Respondent's] web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [Respondent's] web site or location or of a product or service on [Respondent's] web site or location", in bad faith per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for a copycat website constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4; see also *Gallery Department, LLC v. MoisesHardin*, WIPO Case No. D2024-1674, ("Respondent registered the Domain Name and linked it to a website using Complainant's GALLERY DEPT. Mark, including selling Complainant's products and copying the look and feel of Complainant's website. Complainant further alleges that Respondent is selling counterfeit clothing. These actions amount to bad faith use of the Domain Name by Respondent.").

---

[2] Complainant asserts that "there is no such legitimate address" as the address that Respondent used to register the disputed domain name. Respondent did not respond to the Complaint or otherwise provide any evidence that the Registrar confirmed address exists.

Respondent's use of false contact information also is indicative of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6.

This case shares many similarities with *Dansko, LLC v. bunal bunal*, WIPO Case No. D2026-0956 ("*Dansko*"), which may or may not involve the same Respondent. In *Dansko*, respondent "bunal bunal" registered the domain name <danskofeet.com>. The complainant in that case manufactured, marketed, and sold footware and related products under the trademark DANSKO. The respondent in that case maintained "a website that prominently and repeatedly [featured] the Complainant's trademarked name and its distinctive trademarked logo; [and] the site [sold], or [purported] to sell Dansko footwear and related products." The panel in that case held that "[i]t is therefore clear that the Respondent has made bad faith use of the disputed domain name in order to attract Internet users for its commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks and brand."

In light of the foregoing, the Panel finds that 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 <pinggolfpro.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Bradley A. Slutsky/
Bradley A. Slutsky
Sole Panelist
Date: July 7, 2026