

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ensinger GmbH v. 上海恩格欣塑胶制品有限公司 (shang hai en ge xin su jiao zhi pin you xian gong si)

Case No. D2026-2181

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ensinger GmbH, Germany, represented by Menold Bezler Rechtsanwälte Steuerberater Wirtschaftsprüfer Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is 上海恩格欣塑胶制品有限公司 (shang hai en ge xin su jiao zhi pin you xian gong si), China, internally represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <engesinplastics.com> is registered with Cloud Yuqu LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 20, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 21, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Shanghai Engexin Plastic Products Co., Ltd.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 27, 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 amended Complaint in English on May 29, 2026.

On May 27, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On May 29, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

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 Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 22, 2026. On June 2, 2026, the Center received an email communication in Chinese from the Respondent. The Response was filed in English with the Center on June 6, 2026. On June 9, 2026, the Center sent an email to the Respondent requesting confirmation of complete Response, but no reply was received. Therefore, the Center proceeded with the panel appointment process after the Response due date of June 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on July 1, 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 German company founded in 1966 that supplies engineering and high-performance plastics. It has over 2,500 employees and more than 30 production and sales locations worldwide. The Complainant holds the following trademark registrations:

- European Union trademark registration number 000049528 for ENSINGER, registered on June 10, 1998, specifying certain plastic products in class 17;
- German trademark registration number 302019105537 for ENSINGER, registered on May 28, 2019; specifying goods and services in classes 1, 7, 10, 12, 17, 19, and 40;
- German trademark registration number 302019111498 for a figurative ENSINGER mark (the “ENSINGER logo”), registered on September 12, 2019, specifying goods and services in classes 1, 7, 10, 12, 17, 19, and 40; and
- International trademark registration number 1505013 for the ENSINGER logo, registered on October 9, 2019, designating multiple jurisdictions, including China, specifying goods and services in classes 1, 7, 10, 12, 17, 19, and 40.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant also registered the domain name <ensingerplastics.com> on December 16, 2015, which it uses in connection with a website available in multiple languages, including Chinese, where it provides information about itself and its products, including high-performance plastics. The website prominently displays the ENSINGER logo. The hero image shows a man standing in a warehouse. The website offers products that include ABS, cast nylon, extruded nylon, LCP, PA, PAI, PBT, PC, PCT-G, PE, PEEK, PEI, PEKK, PES, PET, polyimide, PK, PMP, POM, PP, PPA, PPE, PPS, PPSU, PSU, PTFE, PVDF, and modified plastics.

The Complainant opened an office in Shanghai, China in 2002 and launched its own production location there in 2007. It now has two locations in Shanghai operated by its affiliates 恩信格国际贸易（上海）有限公司 (Ensinger (China) Co., Ltd) and 恩欣格工程塑料（上海）有限公司 (Ensinger Engineering Plastics (Shanghai) Co., Ltd), as well as a location in Jiaxing operated by its affiliate Ensinger Engineering Plastics (Jiaxing) Co., Ltd. Since at least 2023, Ensinger (China) Co., Ltd has operated a WeChat account that prominently displays the ENSINGER logo and the account name “恩欣格 Ensinger”. The Complainant or its affiliate exhibited at the 2026 SEMICON China trade fair in Shanghai, where its stand prominently displayed the ENSINGER logo and the transcription “恩欣格”.

The Respondent is a Chinese company founded on May 30, 2025. Its Chinese name in Pinyin is “shang hai en ge xin su jiao zhi pin you xian gong si” and its English name is “Shanghai Engexin Plastic Products Co., Ltd”. It is engaged in the manufacture and sale of plastic products, including semi-finished engineering plastics such as PEEK, PTFE, PVDF, POM, PEI, and PPSU.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 5, 2025. It resolves to a website that provides information about plastic products, discreetly displaying a logo with “ENGESiN 恩格欣” shown in tiny print, and titled “One-stop plastic solutions provider based in China”. The hero image shows a businessman signing a document in a showroom. The website is available in multiple languages and offers a global service with deliveries to customers worldwide, including Asia, Europe, North America, and Oceania. The main products are insulating plastic products, antistatic plastic products, and conductive plastic products, including PVDF, PFA, PCTFE, PTFE, POM, PEEK, PEI, PAI, PPSU, nylon, ABS, PE, PP, PVC, bakelite, fiberglass, and acrylic sheets, rods and tubes.

The Complainant sent cease-and-desist letters to the Registrar and hosting providers on April 10, 2026.

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 trademarks, its domain name, and its protected business identifier. The overall impression is therefore one of deliberate imitation and targeting. The disputed domain name appropriates the Complainant’s distinctive mark in a minimally altered form, combines it with a term directly referring to the Complainant’s core business, and is used in a context of identical goods and overlapping markets.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the designation ENSINGER or any confusingly similar sign, whether as a domain name or in any other form. The Respondent does not own any trademark rights in “Engesin” or “Engexin/en ge xin” in any relevant jurisdiction. The Respondent offers products that are identical or highly similar to those of the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been known as “Engesin”. The Respondent has deliberately deviated from its own company name.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant’s marks and business identifiers are inherently distinctive and enjoy substantial recognition in the highly specialized field of engineering and high-performance plastics. The Respondent operates in precisely the same industry and offers identical or highly similar products, based in Shanghai where the Complainant started its own production location as early as 2007. The Respondent has deliberately replaced the letter “x” with “s” in the disputed domain name and adopted the variant “Engesin” rather than its own company name “En ge xin”. This modification materially increases similarity to the Complainant’s mark ENSINGER and its business identifier. The Respondent has combined the imitated element “Engesin” with the term “plastics”, which directly corresponds to the Complainant’s core business and mirrors its well-established identifier and domain name. The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website offering products in direct competition with those of the Complainant. The Respondent explicitly targets international markets. The Respondent only entered the market decades after the Complainant had built a globally recognized business and trademark portfolio. The case bears all the hallmarks of typosquatting.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It is a legally registered company under Chinese law. The disputed domain name is used for the Respondent’s official website, email, and international business activities. The disputed domain name reflects the English transliteration of

the Respondent's Chinese company name “恩格欣”, forming part of the Respondent's legitimate brand identity.

The disputed domain name was not registered and is not being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was not registered to mislead, confuse, or profit from the Complainant's reputation. The Respondent has never claimed to be affiliated with the Complainant, has not used any of the Complainant's logos, trademarks, or branding, and does not suggest any commercial connection. The use of “sin” instead of “xin” in the disputed domain name is a reasonable transliteration choice for the Chinese character “欣” and reflects the Respondent's legitimate brand identity. The Respondent's operations are independent and do not target the Complainant's customers in a misleading way. The Respondent's company name, logo, website, and product branding are distinct from those of the Complainant. All products, communications, and commercial activities clearly indicate the Respondent's origin as a Chinese company. Customers and business partners recognize the Respondent as a separate and independent supplier in the engineering plastics industry.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue - Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name 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, subject to the authority of the panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.

The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English and filed the Complaint and the amended Complaint in that language. The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's request but filed the Response in English.

Given that both Parties filed their respective submissions in English, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

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

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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

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

The first syllable of the mark (“en”) is reproduced in the disputed domain name as its initial element, while the second and third syllables of the mark (“sin” and “ger”) are inverted - omitting the “r”. The Panel does not consider that these differences prevent a finding of confusing similarity, especially since they do not make any semantic difference. Further, despite the addition of the descriptive word “plastics”, sufficient aspects of the mark remain recognizable within the disputed domain name, although reordered. The other additional element in the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) extension (“.com”) which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the first element of the Policy. The Panel also takes note of the circumstances discussed below showing that the Respondent has attempted to target the Complainant and its trademark through the disputed domain name, which confirms a finding of confusing similarity. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.11.1, and 1.15.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name incorporates “engesin”, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s ENSINGER mark, and combines it with the word “plastics”, which describes the Complainant’s core product type. This creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, particularly since the additions of “plastics” and the gTLD extension “.com” in the disputed domain name increase its similarity to the Complainant’s <ensingerplastics.com> domain name as well. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that offers the same type of semi-finished plastic products as the Complainant and only discreetly identifies the Respondent and its company address. In any case, by the time that an Internet user realizes that the Respondent and its website are not affiliated with the Complainant, the disputed domain name has achieved its diversionary purpose. These circumstances do not indicate that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The disputed domain name broadly corresponds to a transliteration and translation of several characters in the Respondent’s company name “上海恩格欣塑胶制品有限公司”, albeit substituting an “s” for the “x” in its English company name “Shanghai Engexin Plastic Products Co., Ltd”. However, the Respondent was only incorporated in 2025 and there is no evidence of use of its Chinese or English company name except in its website footer, and “ENGESiN 恩格欣” in tiny print in a logo on its homepage. Despite the website’s claim that “Engesin China” has 20 years of industry experience, the Respondent’s company name and the disputed domain name were registered only last year. These circumstances do not show that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Further, the website associated with the disputed domain name is clearly commercial. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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.

Turning to the Respondent, it submits that it uses the disputed domain name for its website, email, and international business activities. In support, it provides only its business license issued in May 2025, the disputed domain name registration obtained in December 2025, and a copy of its current homepage. It also filed the Response from an email address using the disputed domain name. It does not allege that it holds any trademark rights. Rather, it submits that the disputed domain name reflects the English transliteration of its Chinese company name “恩格欣”, forming part of the Respondent’s legitimate brand identity. However, the Respondent does not deny that it was aware of the Complainant or its ENSINGER brand (generally transcribed with the same characters as “恩欣格”) when the Respondent registered its company name. Given that the Parties both offer the same types of semi-finished plastics, and that the Complainant has long had production and sales locations in Shanghai, where the Respondent is based, the Panel finds that the Respondent was clearly aware of the significant potential for confusion with the Complainant that would arise from the adoption and use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent offers no explanation as to why it chose its company name. In the Panel’s view, this is a case of registration of a company name as a pretext to justify a domain name registration and thereby to circumvent the application of the Policy. Accordingly, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing.

Based on the 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. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

“(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] web site or location.”

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2025, years after the registration of the Complainant’s ENSINGER marks including, in the case of the ENSINGER logo, in China, where the Respondent is based. The Parties both offer the same types of semi-finished plastics and the Complainant has long had production and sales locations in Shanghai, where the Respondent is based. The disputed domain name is based on the Respondent’s company name, registered six months earlier, which incorporates the same characters that the Complainant generally uses to transliterate its ENSINGER mark, including on its WeChat account (i.e., “恩欣格”), although the Respondent inverts the latter two characters (i.e., “恩格欣”). Although the Respondent’s English name uses the standard Pinyin transliteration of these characters (i.e., “Engexin”), the disputed domain name substitutes an “s” for the “x”, thereby increasing the similarity with the ENSINGER mark. The disputed domain name adds the words “plastics” and the gTLD extension “.com”, which increases its similarity to the Complainant’s domain name <ensingerplastics.com> as well. In view of all these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its ENSINGER mark when it registered the disputed domain name.

As regards use, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering the same type of semi-finished plastic products as the Complainant. The Panel recalls its findings in Section 6.2.B above and finds that, by using the disputed domain name, 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 the Respondent’s website within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent submits that it has never claimed to be affiliated with the Complainant, and has not used any of the Complainant’s logos, trademarks, or branding. However, the registration of the disputed domain

name itself creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent also argues that its operations are independent and do not target the Complainant's customers in a misleading way. However, for the reasons set out above, the Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name itself targets the Complainant and its ENSINGER mark.

Therefore, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <engesinplastics.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: July 13, 2026