

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Yamaha Corporation v. PK das, Quesotic LLP; Pawankumar Das;
PK das, World Store
Case No. D2026-2130

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Yamaha Corporation, Japan, internally represented.

The Respondents are PK das, Quesotic LLP, India; Pawankumar Das, India; and PK das, World Store, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <yamahaamplifierservicecenter.com>, <yamahaaudiomixerservicecenter.com>, <yamahaaudioservicecenter.com>, <yamahaavreceiverservicecenter.com>, <yamahamusicssystemservicecenter.com>, <yamahasoundbarservicecenter.com>, <yamahaspakerservicecenter.com>, and <yamahasubwooferservicecenter.com> are all registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 18, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 18, 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 (GoDaddy.com, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 20, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 21, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on June 19, 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 leading global manufacturer of musical instruments and audio equipment, established in 1897. Its official website is located at the domain name <yamaha.com>, registered on November 1, 1994.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for YAMAHA (the "YAMAHA trademark"), including the following representative registration:

- the United States of America trademark YAMAHA with registration No. 3559368, registered on January 13, 2009, for goods in International Classes 3, 8, 9, 15, and 21.

The details about the dates of registration of the disputed domain names and their registrants are the following:

Disputed domain name	Date of registration	Registrant
<yamahaamplifierservicecenter.com>	January 11, 2016	Pawankumar Das
<yamahaaudioservicecenter.com>	November 12, 2024	PK das, WORLD STORE
<yamahaaudiomixerservicecenter.com>	July 26, 2025	PK das, QUESOTIC LLP
<yamahaavreceiverservicecenter.com>	July 26, 2025	PK das, QUESOTIC LLP
<yamahamusicssystemservicecenter.com>	July 26, 2025	PK das, QUESOTIC LLP
<yamahasoundbarservicecenter.com>	July 26, 2025	PK das, QUESOTIC LLP
<yamahaspeakerservicecenter.com>	July 26, 2025	PK das, QUESOTIC LLP
<yamahasubwooferservicecenter.com>	July 26, 2025	PK das, QUESOTIC LLP

All disputed domain names resolve to websites that present their providers as service centers for YAMAHA-branded audio equipment with titles such as "YAMAHA AMPLIFIER Repair Service", "AUDIO REPAIR", "YAMAHA AMPLIFIER REPAIRS", "WELCOME TO YAMAHA AUDIO REPAIR AND SERVICE", "WELCOME TO YAMAHA AVR AMPLIFIER", "WELCOME TO YAMAHA. AMPLIFIER REPAIRS", "Amplifier Repair", and display photos of YAMAHA-branded audio equipment. The disputed domain name <yamahaaudioservicecenter.com> offers repair services for ONKYO-branded audio equipment. All of the disputed domain names include the following text as part of a small-print copyright notice at the bottom of the webpage: "We are not an authorized Service Center."

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.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its YAMAHA trademark, because they incorporate the trademark in its entirety. The Complainant notes that the addition of dictionary terms related to audio equipment does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the YAMAHA trademark.

According to the Complainant, the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, because they are not commonly known by the name "yamaha", have no affiliation with the Complainant, have not been authorised to provide products or services under the YAMAHA trademark, and have no trademark rights related to "yamaha". According to the Complainant, the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names to present themselves as authorised service centers is a misleading and unauthorised commercial use, which cannot give rise to any rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant points out that YAMAHA is a world-famous trademark and the Complainant's rights in it are easily discoverable through a simple Internet search. According to the Complainant, it is unlikely that the Respondents have registered the disputed domain names without knowing of the Complainant's rights, given that they use the disputed domain names to operate multiple websites, each of which falsely suggests to be a YAMAHA service center without clarifying the Complainant's authorisation. The Complainant concludes that the Respondents intentionally registered and used the disputed domain names to create a likelihood of confusion for commercial gain. The Complainant notes that the coordinated use of multiple domain names incorporating the Complainant's YAMAHA trademark, combined with the Respondents' shared contact details, is further evidence of a deliberate scheme to exploit the goodwill of the YAMAHA trademark for the Respondents' commercial gain.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issue – Consolidation of multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or are under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's consolidation request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the Respondents share identical or highly similar contact details, including the same telephone number, substantially identical addresses, and/or overlapping email accounts. The websites associated with the disputed domain names promote essentially identical repair services for audio equipment. Moreover, the name “PK das” appears to be an abbreviation of “Pawankumar Das”. This supports a conclusion that the disputed domain names are under common ownership or control, notwithstanding the use of different names or organisational labels.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the YAMAHA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the YAMAHA trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the YAMAHA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “amplifier”, “service”, “center”, “audio”, “mixer”, “av” (acronym for “audio-video”), “receiver”, “music”, “system”, “soundbar”, “speaker” and “subwoofer”) 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 names and the YAMAHA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 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 recognised 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 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 incorporate the YAMAHA trademark in combination with dictionary terms for various elements of audio equipment in relation to which the YAMAHA trademark is well-known around the world, and all of them include the term "service center". This makes them appear as referring to official service centers for YAMAHA-branded audio equipment. The associated websites further strengthen this appearance, as they feature images of YAMAHA-branded audio equipment and have titles such as "YAMAHA AMPLIFIER Repair Service", "AUDIO REPAIR", "YAMAHA AMPLIFIER REPAIRS", "WELCOME TO YAMAHA AUDIO REPAIR AND SERVICE", "WELCOME TO YAMAHA AVR AMPLIFIER", "WELCOME TO YAMAHA. AMPLIFIER REPAIRS", "Amplifier Repair". The websites also display the text "We are not an authorized Service Center", but this cannot be regarded as a clear and prominent disclaimer, because it is displayed in small font at the bottom of the webpage as part of a copyright notice, and does not properly disclose the absence of relationship with the Complainant. The website at the disputed domain name <yamahaaudioservicecenter.com> offers repair services for ONKYO-branded audio equipment, when ONKYO is the trademark of one of the Complainant's competitors.

Panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the "Oki Data test", cumulative requirements are applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case. Section 2.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). Considering the above, the Respondent's conduct does not comply with requirements (ii) and (iii) of the Oki Data test and cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that 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 has registered eight disputed domain names which share an identical naming pattern incorporating the YAMAHA trademark, various dictionary terms for elements of audio equipment in relation to which the YAMAHA trademark is well-known, and the term "service center". They are being used for commercially-oriented websites that promote the business of a service center for audio equipment, display the YAMAHA trademark and images of YAMAHA-branded audio equipment, and include an obscure and unclear disclaimer. All this taken together supports a conclusion that by registering and using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the websites at the disputed domain names by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's YAMAHA trademark as to the affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant of the services offered by the Respondent. This supports a finding of registration and use of the disputed domain names in bad faith under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The fact that the Respondent has registered not one, but eight disputed domain names sharing the same naming pattern, also supports a finding that it has registered them in order to prevent the Complainant from reflecting the YAMAHA trademark in a corresponding domain name, and has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct under Paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <yamahaamplifierservicecenter.com>, <yamahaaudiomixerservicecenter.com>, <yamahaudioservicecenter.com>, <yamahaavreceiverservicecenter.com>, <yamahamusicssystemservicecenter.com>, <yamahasoundbarservicecenter.com>, <yamahaspakerservicecenter.com>, and <yamahasubwooferservicecenter.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: July 3, 2026