

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Meyers Printing Companies, Inc. v. cc Technology
Case No. D2026-2282

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Meyers Printing Companies, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Fredrikson & Byron, P.A., United States.

The Respondent is cc Technology, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <packspackages.com> is 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 27, 2026. On May 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 28, 2026, 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 (John Doe / Registration Private, Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 29, 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 2, 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 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Warwick A. Rothnie as the sole panelist in this matter on June 30, 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 was founded in 1949 and since then has been providing packaging and labelling solutions from folding cartons to RFID-enabled solutions. Its customers include many leading brands including FritoLay, Target, Verizon, Microsoft, Nintendo, General Mills, Estee Lauder, Pura and many more. In March 2022, it joined "The Climate Pledge".

The Complainant registered the domain name <meyers.com> in March 1995 and promotes its services and products from the website to which that domain name resolves. The landing page for the website features a logo:



It has tabs for "Solutions", "Sustainability", "About", "Blog", "Resource Videos", "Contact" and a Search box. The "Sustainability" tab features a page headed "Sustainable Printing & Packaging" and another page for a "Sustainable Packaging eBook". There is another page headed "Custom Product Packaging" which provides a link to the Complainant's folding carton solutions and also has a link to the Complainant's "Sustainable Packaging" page.

The Complaint includes evidence that the Complainant owns a number of registered trademarks in the United States:

(1) United States Registered Trademark No. 7,981,576, MEYERS, which has been registered in the Principal Register since October 14, 2025 in respect of a range of manufacturing services in International Class 40 and research, development and engineering services in International Class 42, claiming to have been first used in commerce in 1949;

(2) United States Registered Trademark No. 7,839,382, MEYERS, which has been registered in the Principal Register since June 24, 2025 in respect of printing services in International Class 40 and graphic design services in International Class 42 which also claims to have been used first in commerce in 1949; and

(3) United States Registered Trademark No. 7,969,388, for the teardrop, square and circle device shown adjacent to MEYERS in the logo above and which has been registered in the Principal Register since September 30, 2025 in respect of packing and warehousing services and shipping in International Class 39, printing services in International Class 40, and graphic design services in International Class 42 and which claim to have been used in commerce first in April 2023.

According to the Whois report, the disputed domain name was registered on March 18, 2022.

When the Complaint was filed the URL "www.packpackages.com/about_meyers" resolved to a webpage which purported to be providing printing and packaging services under the Complainant's logo, and using its contact information. The page contained images and text which appear to have been directly copied from the Complainant's website.

At the time this Decision is being prepared the disputed domain name also resolves to the same page.

5. Discussion and Findings

No response has been filed. The Complaint and Written Notice have been sent, however, to the Respondent at the electronic and physical coordinates confirmed as correct by the Registrar in accordance with paragraph 2(a) of the Rules. Bearing in mind the duty of the holder of a domain name to provide and keep up to date correct Whois details, therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present his or its case.

When a respondent has defaulted, paragraph 14(a) of the Rules requires the Panel to proceed to a decision on the Complaint in the absence of exceptional circumstances. Accordingly, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires the Panel to decide the dispute on the basis of the statements and documents that have been submitted and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of the disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

- (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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first element that the Complainant must establish is that the disputed domain name is identical with, or confusingly similar to, the Complainant's trademark rights.

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 contends that the URL "www.packspackages.com/about-meyers/" is confusingly similar to its registered trademarks.

The fundamental difficulty with this contention is that the Policy applies to domain names, not URLs. In this case, the domain name consists of the Top-Level Domain, ".com", and the Second-Level Domain "packspackages". Unfortunately, the Panel cannot find that this disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark, MEYERS. It neither looks nor sounds remotely like the Complainant's registered trademark.

The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its claimed rights in CUSTOM PRODUCT PACKAGING and SUSTAINABLE PACKAGING as unregistered trademarks.

On the materials before the Panel, it does not appear that the Complainant actually uses either expression in a trademark sense, that is, as a badge of origin which consumers associate with the Complainant's services. Secondly, there is no evidence before the Panel when the Complainant began using either expression or of the extent of sales or advertising and promotional expenditures referable to either expression. As both expressions are essentially descriptive, it would require very substantial use specifically referable to either or both expressions as trademarks for the Complainant to have developed secondary meaning in one or other of them.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not established that the disputed domain name is identical with or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, the requirement under the first limb of the Policy is not satisfied and the Complaint must fail.

As the Complaint must fail, no good purpose would be served by considering the other elements under the Policy.

B. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. The mere lack of success of the complaint is not, on its own, sufficient to constitute reverse domain name hijacking. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

While the Complainant has failed to establish the first requirement under the Policy, it is not appropriate to make a finding of reverse domain name hijacking against the Complainant in this case.

The Complainant has affirmed that the Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant to use its trademarks or associated with the Complainant in any way. The Respondent has not contested those points.

In those circumstances, the Respondent's use of the Complainant's trademarks and other indicia on the Respondent's websites is intended to create a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's services. Such blatant conduct is an invasion of the Complainant's rights and cannot lead to the sanction of reverse domain name hijacking against the Complainant.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Warwick A. Rothnie/

Warwick A. Rothnie

Sole Panelist

Date: July 14, 2026