

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lumentum Operations, LLC v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-2236

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lumentum Operations, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Reed Smith LLP, United States.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lumentumusa.com> and <lumentumus.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 22, 2026. On May 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 30, 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 (“REDACTED FOR PRIVACY c/o Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 1, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 5, 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 June 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on July 7, 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 has offered goods and services under the LUMENTUM trademark since at least August 2015 and today offers such goods and services under the LUMENTUM trademark across a variety of industry sectors, including optical communications, networking, laser systems, and photonic components.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

United States Trademark Registration number 5,324,212 for the LUMENTUM (device) trademark, registered on October 31, 2017.

United States Trademark Registration number 5,443,655 for the LUMENTUM (device) trademark, registered on April 10, 2018.

United States Trademark Registration number 5,428,760 for the LUMENTUM (word) trademark, registered on March 20, 2018.

The disputed domain names <lumentumus.com> and <lumentumusa.com> were registered on February 27, 2026, and April 22, 2026 respectively.

The disputed domain names are currently inactive. Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the websites at the disputed domains purport to offer laser systems and photonic products, and identify the operator variously as “Lumentum Photonics” (<lumentumus.com>) and “Lumentum” (<lumentumusa.com>), but, according to the Complainant, no entity by the name “Lumentum Photonics Inc.” exists in any corporate registry or business name registry. In addition, it appears that the disputed domain name <lumentumusa.com> became inaccessible following the Complainant's submission of abuse reports.

Having regard to the above background and to some of the Complainant's allegations regarding the contact details displayed on the Respondent's website, in accordance with the position noted in paragraph 4.8 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)) the Panel has performed limited factual research to assist it in deciding the present case.

In this regard the Panel, amongst other things, has verified that the contact email given on the Respondent's website is non-functional.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends: that the disputed domain names respectively consist of the Complainant's LUMENTUM trademark in its entirety, the first with the addition of the two-letter string “us” and the second with the addition of the three-letter string “usa”, plus the generic Top-Level Domain “.com.” The addition of “us” or “usa” (two well-known geographic abbreviation for the United States) does not distinguish the disputed domain names from the trademark. On the contrary, it increases consumer confusion by suggesting that the disputed domain names are the Complainant's United States-specific websites.

The Complainant further contends that the contact information listed by the Respondent on their webpages is non-functional; all of it is either disconnected phone numbers, non-functional email domains, non-existent physical addresses, or misappropriated phone numbers of the Complainant's. In brief the Complainant contends that the Respondent has fabricated corporate identities, e.g. "Lumentum Photonics Inc.", which do not exist in order to mislead and confuse consumers by impersonating the Complainant's business.

In addition, the website at the domain name <lumentumusa.com> includes a data harvesting form designed to collect personal information from visitors who believe they are interacting with the Complainant. This constitutes use of the disputed domain name in connection with a phishing scheme, which is a well-recognized form of bad faith use.

Both websites are designed to impersonate the Complainant's business and misleadingly divert consumers. The websites offer products (fiber laser systems, photonic components) that directly overlap with the Complainant's actual product lines, including fiber laser systems, photonic components, and VCSEL technology.

The website at the domain name <lumentumus.com> even misappropriates the Complainant's own sales telephone number, demonstrating a deliberate effort to deceive consumers into believing they are dealing with the Complainant.

Finally, the Respondent has enabled Whois privacy on both disputed domain names, concealing its true identity behind a privacy service, and has failed to respond to multiple abuse complaints forwarded by Dynadot, Cloudflare, and Tencent Cloud.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain names, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names. [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 mark is incorporated entirely and recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "us" and "usa", 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 mark 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 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 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.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the use of the disputed domain names (as described under Section C of the Decision) cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. Previous Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as impersonation/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.

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, as discussed below, it is highly likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark registrations and rights to the LUMENTUM trademark when it registered the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names contain in their entirety, without any authorization or approval by the Complainant, the Complainant’s registered LUMENTUM trademark combined with the terms “us” and “usa”.

Also, the composition of the disputed domain names, which incorporate the Complainant’s trademark along with the additional terms “us” and “usa”, combined with the fact that the Respondent’s websites offered products that directly overlap with the Complainant’s actual product lines, and the fact that the Respondent misappropriates the Complainant’s own sales telephone number on the website “www.lumentumus.com,” demonstrates a deliberate effort to deceive Internet users into believing they are dealing with the

Complainant. Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain names, had knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights to the LUMENTUM trademark.

The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in bad faith.

In addition, by using the disputed domain names, the Panel notes that 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 trademark. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed as impersonation and/or passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Respondent has enabled Whois privacy on both disputed domain names, concealing its true identity behind a privacy service; has failed to respond to multiple abuse complaints forwarded by Dynadot, Cloudflare, and Tencent Cloud; has misappropriated the Complainant's own sales telephone number; has displayed incorrect physical address and a non-functional email address on the website "www.lumentumus.com"; and apparently has also fabricated business identities similar to those of the Complainant's in order to confuse and mislead the public.

Finally, the bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names are further supported by the fact that the Respondent has not denied the assertions of bad faith made by the Complainant in these proceedings.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute 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 names <lumentumusa.com> and <lumentumus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Fabrizio Bedarida/

Fabrizio Bedarida

Sole Panelist

Date: July 14, 2026