

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AGFA-GEVAERT N.V. v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-2333

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AGFA-GEVAERT N.V., Belgium, represented by Novagraaf Belgium NV/SA, Belgium.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <agfaus.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 29, 2026. On June 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 2, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 2, 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 amended Complaint on June 4, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Áron László 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 is Agfa-Gevaert N.V., a multinational corporation headquartered in Mortsel, Belgium. With origins dating back to 1867, the company has a long-standing history in imaging technologies. The company was formed through the merger of the German company Agfa and the Belgian company Gevaert in 1964. Today, the Complainant is a global provider of imaging systems and IT solutions, serving healthcare, printing, and industrial markets, with operations in over 40 countries. The Complainant reported a revenue of approximately EUR 1.138 billion in 2024 and employs approximately 4,765 people worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark AGFA, including the following:

- International registration No. 608334 for the word mark AGFA, registered on September 25, 1993, currently designating, inter alia, Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Switzerland and Ukraine;
- International registration No. 621951 for the word and device mark AGFA, registered on June 17, 1994, currently designating, inter alia, Australia, China, Japan, Switzerland and Viet Nam;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 003353463 for the word mark AGFA, registered on January 24, 2005;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 008133167 for the word and device mark AGFA, registered on February 17, 2010.

The Complainant also owns various domain names incorporating the term “agfa” including <agfa.com> and <agfa.cn>.

The disputed domain name was previously the subject of a UDRP proceeding, *AGFA-Gevaert N.V. v. Xinmin Liu*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3397](#), in which the panel ordered transfer of <agfaus.com> to the Complainant on December 12, 2021. The Complainant subsequently allowed the domain name registration to lapse, and the disputed domain name was re-registered by the current Respondent on April 24, 2026.

According to the Registrar’s verification response, the registrant of the disputed domain name is “he jxing”, located in China. The Respondent used a privacy service (“REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot”) to register the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to an active website presenting itself as “Agfa Industrial Inkjet Solutions. Since 1867”. The website prominently displays the AGFA trademark throughout, purported to offer AGFA products including Jeti, Anapurna and Oberon printers, claimed worldwide operations with references to regional depots and factory-trained engineers, and invites visitors to submit commercial enquiries via a contact form requesting company names, work email addresses, and production requirements. The website contains no disclaimer indicating that it is unofficial or independent of the Complainant.

On May 8, 2026, and May 11, 2026, the Complainant’s representative sent cease-and-desist communications to the Respondent using email addresses displayed on the website at the disputed domain name; both emails were rejected by the recipient email server.

The Respondent has been the subject of multiple prior UDRP proceedings in which panels ordered the transfer of domain names incorporating third-party trademarks, including *American Labelmark Company d/b/a Labelmaster v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1015](#); *Kingspan Holdings (IRL) Limited v. he jxing*,

WIPO Case No. [D2026-1710](#) and *Green Bay Packaging Inc. v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0476](#), both resulting in orders to transfer domain names. In addition, the Respondent (identified as “he jxing” or “Jxing HE”) has been the subject of the following proceedings before the Czech Arbitration Court (CAC): CAC-UDRP-108634 (<schneiderelectr.com>), CAC-UDRP-108650 (<saintgobainus.com>), and CAC-UDRP-108533 (<arkemausa.com> and <arkematech.com>), all decided in June and July 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.

The Complainant contends that it is the owner of a broad global trademark portfolio for the mark AGFA, including international and European Union registrations dating back to 1993. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the AGFA trademark, which is the dominant and distinctive element of the domain name. The Complainant argues that the addition of the geographical term “us”, referring to the United States of America, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, and that the generic Top-Level Domain “.com” is disregarded under the first element test. The Complainant further relies on the earlier decision in *AGFA-Gevaert N.V. v. Xinmin Liu*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3397](#) concerning the same domain name, in which the panel found the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the AGFA trademark.

Regarding the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no trademark rights for AGFA, no affiliation with the Complainant, and has never received any licence or consent to use the mark. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that deliberately impersonates the Complainant by presenting itself as “Agfa Industrial Inkjet Solutions · Since 1867”, prominently using the AGFA trademark throughout, claiming worldwide operations, purporting to offer AGFA products and services, and containing no disclaimer of non-affiliation. The Complainant further argues that the website contains inconsistencies, including products and equipment that do not correspond to the Complainant’s actual product portfolio, AI-generated imagery, and a lack of verifiable corporate details, and solicits business-sensitive information from users under the guise of communicating with an “Agfa production specialist”. The Complainant concludes that the Respondent’s use is clearly commercial and misleading, and cannot qualify as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

Regarding the third element, the Complainant contends that the AGFA trademark is well-known worldwide and that it is inconceivable the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration, given that the website expressly refers to “Agfa Industrial Inkjet Solutions · Since 1867” and relies exclusively on the AGFA name to attract Internet users. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the website, falling within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and that the website solicits business enquiries under the false impression that visitors are dealing with the Complainant, constituting deception and possible fraud. The Complainant argues there is no plausible good-faith explanation, noting the Respondent concealed its identity behind privacy services and built a website falsely purporting to be an official AGFA business without any disclaimer. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent, or an entity under its control, has engaged in a pattern of abusive registrations, citing WIPO Case Nos. D2026-1015 and D2026-0476, falling within paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. Finally, the Complainant notes that cease-and-desist communications sent on May 8 and May 11, 2026 were rejected by the recipient email server.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- i. the domain name registered by the respondent 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 domain name; and
- iii. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondents’ failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this dispute on the basis of the Complainant’s undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.3.

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. [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 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 term, here, “us” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Complainant and its AGFA trademark is well-known worldwide and that it is inconceivable the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration, given that the website expressly refers to "Agfa Industrial Inkjet Solutions · Since 1867" and relies exclusively on the AGFA name to attract Internet users.

The Panel finds that the Respondent is intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the website, falling within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and that the website solicits business enquiries under the false impression that visitors are dealing with the Complainant, constituting deception and possible fraud.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive registrations, citing WIPO Case Nos. D2026-1015, D2026-1710 and D2026-0476, showing remarkable similarity to the present case, falling within paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

In each of the above proceedings, the respective panels found that the Respondent had registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith, and ordered transfer. Of particular relevance, in *Kingspan Holdings (IRL) Limited v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1710](#) concerning <kingspanus.com>, where the same Respondent registered a domain name incorporating the complainant's KINGSPAN trademark together with the geographical term "us", the panel found that the disputed domain name resolved to a website designed to mimic the complainant's offerings, that the Respondent's use constituted passing off, and that in the absence of a credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was targeting the complainant with the intention to capitalize on the fame of the complainant's trademark. This addition draws a direct parallel with the present case, as it involves the same Respondent ("he jxing"), the same Registrar (Dynadot Inc), an identical naming pattern (well-known trademark + "us"), and near-identical conduct (an impersonation website mimicking the complainant's business).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent concealed its identity behind a privacy service and that the Complainant's cease-and-desist communications were rejected by the email server at the disputed domain name, further supporting a finding of bad faith.

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 name <agfaus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Áron László/

Áron László

Sole Panelist

Date: July 17, 2026